DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 869 FL 011 414

AUTHOR	Eddy, Peter A.; And Others
TITLE	Chinese Language Study in American Higher Education: State of the Art. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Center for Applied Linguistics, Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Postsecondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of International Education.
BUREAU NO	436AH80006
PUB DATE	80
GRANT	G007802366
NOTE	165p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Chinese; *College Second Language Programs; Degrees (Academic); Enrollment; *Enrollment Trends; Financial Support; Higher Education; Independent Study; Instructional Materials; *Program Descriptions; Questionnaires; *Second Language Instruction; *Student Characteristics; Surveys; Teacher Characteristics

ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to provide recent and comprehensive information on the state of Chinese studies in the United States. An extensive questionnaire was completed by 111 American institutions of higher education offering Chinese instruction. Overall enrollments and enrollment trends are discussed, and the degrees awarded in 1978 are enumerated. Characteristics of teachers of Chinese are described. A catalogue of information on instructional materials emphasizes the assessment of instructional needs in first- through fourth-year courses. Aspects of Chinese language instruction in the United States, which is represented by a wide variety of programs, are discussed. Characteristics of students of Chinese are examined. Funding of Chinese language instruction and potential funding resources are reported. A shorter questionnaire was completed by institutions offering only self-study programs. Responses from institutions that had recently dropped Chinese instruction from their curriculum are also analyzed. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS 1611 N. Kent Street Arlington, VA 22209

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED185869

Final Report

Chinese Language Study in the United States:
The State of the Art

CFDA No. 13.436 (Research and Studies)
Grant No.: G007802366
CRS Entity No.: 1-520807619-A1
Document No.: G007802366
Project No.: 436AH80006
CAN No.: 78 2003043
Project Officer: Mrs. Julia Petrov

Principal Investigator: Peter A. Eddy
Institution: Center for Applied Linguistics
Grant Period: 1 July - 31 January 1980

FL011414

THE CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS * 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, VA 22209

Chinese Language Study in American Higher Education:
State of the Art

by

Peter A. Eddy
James J. Wrenn
Sophia A. Behrens

with
Leonard A. Shaefer, Jr.
Nadine Mandel
Donna Vanderhoff

The cooperation in this project of the Language Processing Center, Georgetown University, is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part 1: Introduction 1

Part 2: Chinese Language Teaching in the U.S.: The State of the Art - A Retrospective View

2.1 The Difficulty of the Chinese Writing System 4
2.2 Methodology and Language Competence 5
2.3 Demands for Language Training 5
2.4 Personnel Resources 6
2.5 Teacher Development 6
2.6 Teaching and Reference Materials 7
2.7 Audiotaped Materials 10
2.8 Movies and Television 11
2.9 Computer Assisted Instruction 12
2.10 Institutional Resources 12
2.11 Librarians 14
2.12 Language Laboratories 15
2.13 Language Centers in America 15
2.14 Overseas Language Centers 16
2.15 Endnotes 18

Part 3: Survey Population and Respondents

3.1 Rate of Response 19
3.2 Institution Types 19
3.3 Why Institutions Drop Chinese Language Instruction 22

Part 4: Enrollments and Degrees Awarded

4.1 Data from Modern Language Association Surveys 24
4.2 Data from CAL Survey: Enrollments in Fall 1974, 1977, 1978 24
4.3 Enrollments in "language learning" and "language using" courses: Fall 1974, 1977, 1978 27
4.4 Enrollments in all courses dealing with Chinese language during academic year 1978-1979 29
4.5 Enrollment trends anticipated and estimated impact of normalization with the People's Republic of China 31
4.6 Degrees Awarded during Calendar Year 1978 33

Part 5: Chinese Language Instructors: Who are they?

5.1 Introduction 38
5.2 Instructional responsibilities of staff, by category 40
5.3 Hiring Practices and Prospects 41
5.4 Pedagogical Training and Professional Development Opportunities 42
5.5 Instructor-Related Changes to Improve Chinese Language Instruction 45
5.6 "Outreach" Activities of Faculty Members 46

Part 6: Materials of Instruction

6.1 Textbooks in Current Usage 47
6.2 Use of Supplementary Materials 47
6.3 Most needed materials of Instruction 54
6.4 Materials under Development 56

Part 7: Program Characteristics

7.1 Organizational "Home" of Chinese Language Study 56
7.2 Program Structure 59
7.3 Testing 65
7.4 Methods of Utilizing Taped Instructional Materials 66
7.5 Chinese Dialects and Romanizations Taught in Institutions Surveyed 68
7.6 Study Abroad 69
7.7 Self-Instructional Chinese (Self Study Programs) 74

Part 8: Student Characteristics

8.1 Language Competence of Arriving Students 77
8.2 Language Competence of Graduating Students 82
8.3 Student Motivation for Studying Chinese 95
8.4 Students' Present and Future Career Plans 86

Part 9: Funding Chinese Language Instruction

9.1 Institutional Support During Academic Year 1978-79 89
9.2 Outside Support (Governmental and Foundation) for Instructional Programs 90
9.3 U.S. Government and Foundation Support for Chinese Instruction not Directly Related to Programs 93

Part 10: Conclusions and Recommendations 95

Appendix A: Project Narrative 102

Appendix B: List of Chinese Language Instructional Materials Under Development 105

Appendix C: Survey Form 109

Appendix D: List of Respondents to Long Survey Form 145

Bibliography: 148

1.0 Introduction

This study has been done in order to provide more recent and comprehensive information than has been available about Chinese language instruction in U.S. higher education since Wrenn's (1968) Chinese Language Teaching in the United States: The State of the Art. The two major works treating Chinese studies which have appeared since Wrenn (Lindbeck [1971] Understanding China and Lambert [1973] Language and Area Studies Review) contain limited discussion of Chinese language teaching, and treat data through the end of the 1960's only. Enrollments in Chinese language courses, collected by the Modern Language Association (MLA) surveys conducted in fall 1970, 1972, 1974, and 1977, are sufficient only to provide an indication of overall trends, since the MLA collects only total enrollment figures in undergraduate and graduate courses from the registrars of American institutions of higher education. It was our feeling in undertaking the research for this report that the field of Chinese language teaching was in need of a data-based study that would reflect current practice in American teaching of the Chinese language.

With one exception, the report that follows takes the structure of the questionnaire we used to perform our survey. That exception is to be found in Section 2 of our report, authored by James J. Wrenn: "Chinese Language Teaching in the United States: The State of the Art - A Retrospective View." In this section, Wrenn has examined particularly teacher training, materials of instruction, library resources, and overseas language training resources.

Section 3 of the report provides an overview of our survey procedures and explanations of the institutional categories by which we have cross-tabulated much of the information obtained from our respondents. In addition, we discuss the rate of return in our survey, and discuss responses obtained from institutions which at the time of the survey had recently abandoned their Chinese language instructional programs. A more detailed account of our survey procedures may be found in Appendix A.

In Section 4, we discuss overall enrollments and enrollment trends, comparing them with data obtained from MLA surveys. Further, we examine the number of enrollments in "Language-Learning" and "Language-Using" courses, courses about Chinese offered in English, summer courses and extension courses. Finally, we examine the undergraduate and the graduate degrees offered by our respondents' institutions, and tally the number of students having received these degrees during calendar year 1978.

In Section 5, we discuss the teachers of Chinese as described by our respondents. What responsibilities do they have? What proportion are native speakers, and how recently have they had the opportunity to upgrade their pedagogical and linguistic training, and their knowledge of current idiomatic usage in Mandarin? How many openings for instructional personnel are there likely to be over the next five years in American institutions of higher education? What instructor-related changes are considered by our respondents to be most important for the betterment of Chinese language instruction on the campuses in this country?

An extensive list of Chinese materials of instruction has been published recently (Dora E. Johnson, et al., "A Survey of Materials for the Study of the Uncommonly Taught Languages: Languages of Eastern Asia," 1976), and the file of these materials at the Center for Applied Linguistics undergoes constant updating. Information has not been available, however, about what materials are most used in first-year through fourth-year Chinese, both basic texts and character instruction materials, as well as supplementary materials, both printed and audio-visual. In Section 6 of our report, we attempt to catalogue this information, and to obtain an assessment from our respondents of what sorts of materials are most needed in the near future, as well as what materials of instruction individuals are developing on their own at present.

In Section 7, we discuss a number of aspects of Chinese language instructional programs in American higher education. Chinese is taught in a variety of different types of academic "units" in American colleges and universities, some of them quite surprising to the uninitiated observer. In addition to discussing this issue, we catalogue the various ways in which Chinese language instruction is organized, and discuss class size and number of sections of first-year Chinese, as well as the total number of hours of instruction per year received by students in first-year through fourth-year language courses. In addition, we analyze the results obtained from our respondents concerning the amount of emphasis placed upon various language skills (for example, pronunciation, mastery of grammatical structures, mastery of Chinese characters, etc.) in different kinds of institutions from elementary through advanced language instruction. We discuss the kind of testing that is done both for placement and for demonstration of achievement. We discuss study abroad, including the number of students who go the Far East for Chinese language study and what institutions they attend there. Finally, we analyze the returns from a small survey done of institutions which provide instruction in Chinese only through a self-instructional mode.

In Section 8, we discuss questions relating to students of Chinese, both undergraduate and graduate. What is the language competence in Chinese of incoming students, and how have they obtained this competence? What is the language competence upon departure from the institutions surveyed? Why are these students studying Chinese, and what do they end up doing after they receive their diplomas?

Section 9 deals with the funding of Chinese language instruction on U.S. campuses. In addition to analyzing the information returned by our respondents, we discuss the results of our investigation of a number of federal and private foundation sources which are potential funders of Chinese language instruction and materials development.

Section 10 of the report summarizes the most important findings of our survey, and enumerates the recommendations that follow from the information gathered in this research.

Even as the data were being keypunched and analyzed in summer and fall 1979, there was evidence that enrollments in Chinese language were increasing rather dramatically in some institutions because of the impact on American public opinion of normalization of relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China. It is extremely likely, therefore, that the enrollment figures and some of the other information discussed below no longer accurately reflect the current status of Chinese language instruction. It is likely, for instance, that enrollments in elementary courses in fall 1979 were higher than in fall 1978, the year for which we gathered data in our survey. In any event, the comprehensive data we have gathered for academic year 1978-79 will serve as baseline information for similar studies to be conducted using our questionnaire or an adaptation of it in the future.

2.0 CHINESE LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE U.S.: The State of the Art - A Retrospective View,[1] by James J. Wrenn

In reviewing the state of the art report that I prepared in 1968, it is clear that some of the problems that were with us then are still with us, some have been brought to partial solution, and that much has changed in response to a different political climate and to advances in the field. Some problems, once perceived as simple, have begun to show their complexities.

It is useful to state again the assumptions that I make in this assessment, and to make clear the basis for them.

We still assume that most students and educators agree that the student learns the Chinese written language after he has some control over spoken Chinese, but that he learns the Chinese language so that he will be better able to read materials written in Chinese, to talk in Chinese with others about his reading, and at more advanced levels, to conduct research using sources in written Chinese. Chinese is still not studied as a spoken language alone (even though some few students have only this as a terminal goal), but in addition to spoken Chinese, students are expected to learn, and teachers to teach, the Chinese writing system, and the reading of Chinese. The dialect taught in American schools is still Standard Chinese (Putonghua or 'Mandarin'), although other dialects are also taught in a few institutions.

2.1 The Difficulty of the Chinese Writing System

Reading is introduced in most Chinese courses, but because of the difficulty of the writing system and its lack of dependence on the spoken language, the level of competence that is reached in reading Chinese after two or three years of study (in an academic schedule) is still so low as to leave the student 'functionally illiterate.' This is because the writing system is intrinsically more difficult than any writing system used for representing any Western language, and because many of the "familiar languages" are closely related to English. Chinese, by contrast, has almost no common stock of words that are similar in form or meaning to any of the European languages, and it uses grammatical categories that are unfamiliar to speakers of most European languages. In the case of the more familar languages, we can assume that the student, in learning to listen and speak, will achieve a parallel competence in reading; we cannot make this assumption for Chinese.

In addition, the continuity of the Chinese writing system forces us to live with the fact that any item out of the past can exist in modern usage, so we must accommodate to the panchronic range of script modifications, styles, and literary genres that characterizes the written record of the last two-and-a-half millennia of Chinese literary output. This requires that we adopt our methodologies and attitudes to social, religious, and political systems that have a two-thousand year time depth.

2.2 Methodology and Language Competence

There is still a strong demand for language training in Chinese, although we no longer have the sense of emergency in our need. Americans now have increased opportunity for contact with the Chinese-speaking world, and more and more students and administrators are willing to commit time and resources to the learning and teaching of Chinese.

But there has been a shift. As we begin to take for granted the wider availability of those who can speak and read Chinese, we are now aware that in all but a few narrowly defined areas, much more is needed. We need content specialists who are competent in Chinese. The number of opportunities for scholars and researchers with advanced degrees in Chinese has become sharply restricted.[2] Opportunities in scientific research, business and teaching, both here and in Chinese-speaking areas are more widely available to those with competence in Chinese. In many fields, such opportunities are not available to those who do not have competence in Chinese.

Nationally, our facilities for the development of scholars are adequate, but there continues to be pressure for ways to enable students and workers in many fields to develop competence in Chinese. Language skills are still thin.

2.3 Demands for Language Training

There is still great pressure on language training facilities, and on the maintenance and development of research library facilities, while the development of data-processing techniques of literary, scientific and humanistic studies (particularly the social sciences) in Chinese has improved substantially. At every level of Chinese language teaching our most valuable resources continue to be 1) the language teachers, who develop new resources, cross-train those in other disciplines, and 2) those who operate at the next higher stage, who train language teachers, researchers, and professional librarians for Chinese collections--who are responsible for the quality of the next generation of scholars and researchers.

We are still short of qualified teachers who understand the importance of good language habits, teachers who understand how to teach language, and believe language teaching is important. We still need to develop attitudes toward the study of Chinese that will encourage more intelligent and highly-motivated students to begin the study of Chinese as a foundation for careers in business and in disciplines for which Chinese language skills are prerequisite.

10

2.4 Personnel Resources

Earlier anxieties about manpower resources have abated with time and continual training, and especially with the development of a large number of specialists in Chinese linguistics, many of whom are able language teachers as well. In some measure, our needs have shrunk, and are not now so desperate as they were.

The single element that inhibits more rapid increase of institutions offering Chinese language instruction at all levels at the present time is cost. Federal funding for language programs has been sharply reduced, and the prospect that it will be expanded is not sufficiently certain to encourage academic administrators to commit scarce institutional resources to the expansion of old programs, much less to create new ones.

In this time of financial stress, university administrators are speaking less of humanistic goals and more of cost effectiveness. We are being encouraged to look less at the quality of our graduate faculty and more at the quality of our undergraduate instruction. Clearly, we must do both.

We must do both in a situation where administrators are weighing the effects of United States China policy, and of language reform in China. In many ways we are feeling again the effects of the hasty introduction of Russian in the post-Sputnik era, at a time when long-term commitments were made to some whose qualifications and adaptability to the American scene had not been tested. New laws inspire caution in recruitment practices since many initial positions now reflect those which will become permanent.

The need for Chinese language training will continue to expand, but slowly; we will not need many more teachers in the near future.

2.5 Teacher Development

Although teacher's manuals for newer materials provide careful directions, the specific skills required in the teaching of Chinese to non-native speakers of Chinese have rarely been taught formally. Bilingual education has begun to take a higher priority.

In many smaller institutions with limited offerings on China, the expectation persists that someone who is 'in Chinese' is necessarily competent to teach the language. Chinese language teachers are less often asked to teach Chinese area or civilization courses, but there are still many individuals who are by training and inclination historians or political scientists pressed into service as language teachers. In these times of financial stringency and shrunken job markets, this use of personnel offers financial advantages for institutions and sometimes for individuals.

Thus, although there have been notable improvements in the teaching materials available to us, the lack of formal training in language teaching and the use of part-time teachers whose primary interests are not in language teaching have kept our language teaching techniques at a consistently low level of development in many institutions.

At the secondary school level, there is considerably less interest in developing new programs in Chinese language, and existing programs can be adequately staffed from the pool of available teachers, as long as there is a small number of replacements for those who retire or change careers. The problems of cultural and linguistic adaptation for native Chinese who are beginning to teach in this country have become reduced through improved English language teaching in Taiwan, where most of our native teachers have come from. The increasing opportunities for Americans to live in Asia in Chinese-speaking communities during their undergraduate and graduate training have made it possible for them to gain better fluency in the language. The development of materials for teaching Chinese language that are suitable for use by relatively unskilled teachers has also temporarily reduced the need for expensive teacher training programs in Standard Chinese.

Because we have a relatively stable population of language teachers, many of whom have come most directly from Taiwan, and are out of touch with recent changes, we will continue to have a slow accommodation to, and recognition of, changes in the writing system, lexicon, grammar, and culture resulting from political events of the past thirty years. This is a problem that can be effectively addressed through the preparation and use of materials that present these changes.

2.6 Teaching and Reference Materials

With the development of new materials for the teaching of Chinese during recent years, it is inappropriate to rely on Professor Nicholas C. Bodman's excellent survey of 1965,[3] but I will attempt to preserve the tone of his original in updating my 1968 overview, and will omit the extensive comments on the particular texts available, since they are treated in extensive detail on pages 1-19 of the Survey of Materials for the Study of Uncommonly Taught Languages, published by the Center for Applied Linguistics in 1976.[4] I will limit my comments to texts that both integrate well with the oral-aural approach in its many forms, and which are new, or have stood the test of time.

DeFrancis' Beginning Chinese, Intermediate Chinese, and Advanced Chinese are thorough and include excellent drill materials. These texts emphasize the basic sentence method. Other popular texts which emphasize a somewhat different teaching philosophy are Speak Chinese, Speak Mandarin, and Chinese Dialogues. Rather than using basic sentences, they stress acquisition of the basic construction types in the pattern sentence method, which are well exemplified and drilled, but do not require the degree of memorization inherent in the basic sentence method. Another philosophy is represented by the situational method, which emphasizes the acquisition and drill of sentences that are appropriate to a particluar, well-defined common social situation, as exemplified in the series of modules prepared under the title Standard Chinese: A Modular Approach.[5] This method risks the problems of introducing high-frequency, but complex grammatical elements earlier in the course than the other materials, in situations where they would naturally be used, and requires careful organization and grammatical notes to help the student in mastering the material.

There are three issues involved in dealing with the introduction of the written component: when to introduce it, whether to teach the 'full' or 'simplified' script forms first, and whether one should be taught to the exclusion of the other .

It is possible to study spoken Chinese without reference to the written language, for which any of the above materials are suitable for an elementary or intermediate course. However, students are generally interested in learning to read Chinese, and teachers to teach reading, either because of the intrinsic interest in the writings or the writing system, but more probably as a tool for reading in a specific field. In a two-year sequence of courses, about half the time is spent in reading. But there is a wide variation in the point at which the writing system is introduced and how much is devoted to speech and to reading. A text which introduces both together is Elementary Chinese, (Beijing 1971) which has been in a continual stage of development from its early stages as a reader published in Beijing in 1958. In its later metamorphoses, its basic sentence format has been supplemented by the Elementary Chinese Companion by Jamieson and Lin, which provides exercises, reviews, and structural and lexical analyses to help overcome the drawbacks of the text, and make it easier to use.

Generally, most programs allow two to four weeks before the written component is introduced. Two approaches are used: in one, initial emphasis is on the characters that represent spoken items with which the student is already familiar; in another, emphasis is on the systematic presentation of the writing system. The Read Chinese series of three books and the DeFrancis Beginning Chinese Reader, Intermediate Chinese Reader, and Advanced Chinese Reader do both; they introduce characters and base reading exercises on the materials which are assumed to have been introduced in the oral-aural materials to which they are companions. Both sets make no attempt to parallel the companion texts closely, and in later stages the DeFrancis materials and the more advanced texts in the Yale materials accommodate to the fact that spoken and written language are divergent, and base material more on written than spoken models.

One series, Modern Written Chinese, A New Approach, presents a more systematic introduction to the writing system than any of the above materials. It is prepared as a self-study text to be used with a teacher, but does not assume familiarity with spoken Chinese, although it does emphasize that familiarity with spoken materials is an asset in learning to read.

The choice of script styles is partly dictated by pedagogic considerations, since only Elementary Chinese and its Companion use simplified forms exclusively, and partly by objectives which require that students be familiar with the full forms of characters as well--objectives that are formed by students or by teachers acting in their students' long-term interests.

Both the DeFrancis texts and Modern Written Chinese, A New Approach present the full and simplified forms of the characters, but both assume the full forms will be learned first. In the DeFrancis materials the exercises in simplified characters are short and keyed to the lesson in the full forms, while in the other, the number of reading selections in both Taipei and Beijing newspapers is about equal.

Although the range of newspapers and books printed in simplified characters is increasingly widespread, and there are a few collections such as Easy Chinese Readings prepared by the Beijing Language Institute (Beijing, Commercial Press 1975), there is a real shortage of suitably annotated text materials available at every level, and for every field.

In view of the small market, the high cost of typesetting, and the planned introduction of more simplified characters to the approved list, with the prospect of the need for continual revision, it seems unlikely that materials for students in the West will become widely available as a result of normal textbook production forces. The production of such annotated reading materials is now of high priority. Students need materials that will present the usage of present-day China, and supply the annotations that will help them to see the effect of recent changes, changes that may well be beyond the experience of their teachers. To the extent that annotations expand the awareness of both teachers and students, they will be doubly valuable.

For reading materials at the intermediate and advanced levels written in the full forms of characters, there are, in addition to those described above, the Intermediate Reader in Modern Chinese by Harriet Mills, the character version of A Sketch of Chinese History by Henry Fenn and the Chinese Newspaper Manual prepared by Tien-yi Li, and texts such as I Want to Study! and The New Year's Sacrifice for which the Chinese Linguistics Project at Princeton has prepared Student's Companion volumes.

Towards the end of two or three years of study the student will no longer be working with textbooks, and will be expected to make use of an increasingly wider variety of Chinese sources.

Remarkable improvement in Chinese lexicography has taken place over the past decade, and many of the fruits of years of effort are already available or will soon become available in college bookstores. The most popular comprehensive dictionary, available in a number of sizes from desk to pocket, is A New Practical Chinese-English Dictionary, edited by Liang Shih-chiu and published in Taipei (1971) by the Far East Book Company. Soon to become widely available is A Chinese-English Dictionary, prepared by the English Department of the Beijing Language Institute, published in Beijing in 1979 by the Commercial Press. This has extensive examples of modern usage in simplified characters with the examples translated into English.

An excellent Chinese-Chinese dictionary, also emphasizing modern usage, is the Xiandai Hanyu Cidian (Dictionary of Contemporary Chinese) prepared by the Institute of Languages of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and published by the Commercial Press in Beijing (1978). If the student is working in earlier periods of Chinese he or she will also want the Tz'u Hai, which is written in a modified literary style, but gives full citations of sources. George A. Kennedy's informative and often amusing guide to the Tz'u Hai, entitled ZH Guide, An Introduction to Sinology, is helpful to students unfamiliar with its use. The English-Chinese Dictionary by Herbert A. Giles is still available in various reprints and continues to be useful for both classical and documentary styles.

2.7 Audiotaped Materials

Except for the tapes which are the core of the text series Standard Chinese-A Modular Approach, the availability of radio news broadcasts on tape with accompanying glosses (such as those recently done by the University of Kansas), and those prepared by James Liang at the University of Pennsylvania with a book of annotations which appear as Topics on Chinese Society, very little has changed in the preparation on Chinese language tapes, largely for the same reasons noted in my 1968 state-of-the-art report. Very few teachers have the skills to prepare fully integrated programs in which tapes have a full teaching role. Institutional goals continue to be varied, thus limiting the market for tapes produced, and commercial publishers, who expect to take a loss on language tapes, are not willing to enter a field with such a small market. The university presses that supply most Chinese texts are not able to absorb heavy losses on low volume. We are still where we were in 1968, dealing with garbled, low-fidelity second and third generation copies of tapes that were often badly conceived and prepared at less-than-professional standards on machines that are now seen to be of low quality.

But like radio, audiotape has not died. It is relatively simple, with technical advances providing improved quality at lower cost. It is relatively easy to edit on inexpensive equipment, and, unlike videotape, both the recording and playback equipment are widely available, inexpensive, and built to a single set of international standards.

2.8 Movies and Television

Movies and videotaped materials are still under-utilized, partly because the arrangements for using the equipment are often incovenient, and partly because teachers are often unfamiliar with the equipment which is available to them. It is still true that emphasis on literacy training operates to the detriment of training in auditory comprehension, and almost assures that a student with only two years of Chinese will not be able to understand programs originally directed at a Chinese audience.

While we may assert with some justification that these media deserve to remain less utilized until we change our priorities, we should look at what we are missing when we refuse to adapt our teaching to their use.

Both film and television provide a wide range of situationally correct usage, much of which could never find its way into a classroom in any other way. The kinesic range for typical characters is sharply defined, for example, as is the full tonal range appropriate to normal conversational and emotionally stressful situations. All these elements provide a view of the culture that can be missed even if one is taking part in it.

Movies bring greater clarity of image than television, but at greater cost, and with some loss of flexibility, since film projection equipment lacks the capacity for easy replay of short segments. For both television and film, adaptations of the original sound track for students with lower levels of comprehension are expensive, either because adaptation usually requires that the movies or tapes be owned by the institution orbecause of ownership rights or incompatibility of equipment. Another approach is careful preparation of ancillary material such as scripts, notes and exercises that make them easier for students at many levels to use. This method has been used recently at Princeton in the preparation of Study-Manuals for two films of the late nineteen forties, Biao (The Watch) and Ai Le Zhong Nian (The Sorrows and Joys of Middle Age). A similar approach has been employed in the Chinese Videotape Project conducted by the Stanford-Berkeley Joint East Asia Language and Area Center. Four videotapes from Taiwanese television have been adapted for use in intermediate language instruction and advanced language maintenance for Mandarin. Eight language lessons have been written to accompany the videotapes, and the eleven additional tapes are accompanied by lists of characters and short scene-by-scene synopses in English, plus summaries in Chinese.

Either of the approaches--preparation of alternative sound tracks or of comprehensive study guides--is a time-consuming activity requiring collaboration between teachers and curriculum developers. Until we make a stronger commitment to developing aural comprehension skills in Chinese, these media will continue to be too expensive or inconvenient for most programs.

2.9 Computer Assisted Instruction

The television screen has another function when teamed with a suitably programmed computer. It is an excellent presentation device for various types of computer assisted instruction. In recent years as the price of computers has lowered dramatically and the cost for large memory units also has reduced, we have begun to renew our interest in developing versions of programmed learning. Improvements have been startling; characters that are readable, if not aesthetically pleasing, can be stored and presented relatively cheaply, and a number of experimental programs for the teaching of Chinese language have been developed and tested. The capability of these systems has been proven, but the rising cost of computer programming keeps it from being cost effective as a device for teaching reading. For teaching writing, a more complex and therefore more expensive programming task, it has the additional disadvantage of being kinaesthetically unsatisfying as well As more responsive hardware and programming become available at acceptable cost, we can look for a revival of interest in computer assisted instruction in Chinese.

2.10 Institutional Resources

In addition to the textbooks, reference works, and taped materials that are generally available, some of the more important resources for the study of Chinese language and literature in America are those institutional resources shared by the community of scholars throughout the country, that bring great benefit to particular regions of the country, or to the Chinese programs at the institutions where they are maintained.

The most important of these is the totality of library holdings in Chinese language and literature in the United States and Canada. In June of 1967 these holdings amounted to a total of 2,734,820 volumes, and had increased to a total of 4,023,895 by June of 1975.[6,7] Since the 1968 report, the number of libraries with holdings of more than twenty-five thousand volumes has increased from twenty-four to thirty-five, with twenty libraries holding more than fifty thousand volumes each. These twenty libraries are listed in order of the size of their holdings in Chinese in Table 1.

In the light of increasing costs of acquisitions and of the labor costs involved in cataloging these acquisitions, there is increasingly a need to rely on our unique pattern of interlibrary activity, and the service organization that characterizes American librarianship; to consider libraries as regional and national resources. However, the very costs which make interlibrary activity so valued, make it increasingly apparent that the burden of maintaining catalogues that will be adequate for scholarly researchers will become prohibitive in a very few years, and that although the best-financed libraries will be able to continue to maintain their collections for a few years, there must come to be increasing emphasis on cooperative cataloguing, acquisitions, and searches at increasingly more sophisticated levels.

TABLE 1

HOLDINGS OF CHINESE BOOKS IN AMERICAN LIBRARIES AS OF 30 JUNE 1975[6]

Ranking		Holdings
1.	Library of Congress Oriental Division	414,963
2.	Harvard University	336,023
3.	University of Chicago	210,772
4.	Princeton University	220,229
5.	Columbia University	200,818
6.	Cornell University	195,071
7.	University of California at Berkeley	173,755
8.	University of Michigan at Ann Arbor	169,151
9.	Yale University	164,135
10.	Hoover Institute Library	156,709
11.	University of British Columbia	137,038
12.	University of Washington, Seattle* Far Eastern Library	130,398
13.	University of California at Los Angeles	(83,445)
14.	University of Wisconsin	(78,090)
15.	Brown University	71,187
16.	University of Toronto	60,316
17.	University of Arizona	57,659
18.	Ohio State University	55,675
19.	University of Minnesota	52,918
20.	Darmouth College	50,160

(   ) estimates

*Additional holdings in the Law Library: 15,000 volumes.

All of the resources of the interlibrary loan system and other cooperative facilities are important tools for the advanced student and scholar whose skills are already developed, but the maintenance of these facilities is too expensive to indulge mere browsing.

There is a responsibility on the scholar to define searches of the system so that they will be most efficient, and for the institutions that have responsibility maintaining and developing such systems to make information and materials accessible to such searchers. For such institutions, accessibility can be improved by making the computerized retrieval system more efficient, or by making the librarians working with these collections more efficient.

For the younger scholar, physical proximity to a major collection continues to be the most valuable resource. It is possible to browse through a major collection, with its cards, terminals, and bibliographies and decide which items need to be loaned to the scholar's home library, and which to be duplicated or purchased. The student who is not fully able to use the resources of a Chinese library has more serious difficulties, and is completely dependent on his teachers or on the Chinese librarian at the home institution.

2.11 Librarians

Competent librarians in Chinese collections are already working at the limit of their capabilities. Very few of the librarians responsible for the development of Chinese collections have been trained for the level of responsibility they have been forced to assume. Some good Chinese collections have been developed almost solely on the basis of the excellent series of carefully selected reprints now widely available from many sources. Well-trained librarians and bibliographers are still in short supply, and there is a real danger that they cannot be replaced. This would not only remove an important resource, so important to the teaching function of each institution, but would put a still heavier burden for sophistication on the limited cooperative search facilities which exist.

Library acquisitions have put us closer to our research goals than we were ten years ago. National and local collections have expanded, but the challenge for real cooperation in the development of sophisticated bibliographic controls is still with us. Changes are taking place, but commitment to fund the research capability that will carry us into the twenty-first century is still lacking.

2.12 Language Laboratories

Among the institutional resources, language laboratories as separate facilities have become less important than they were, largely as a result of improvement in the drive mechanism of the portable cassette tape recorder, and of chip circuitry that makes improved fidelity available at a lower price. This shifts some of the burden of maintenance and replacement of expensive equipment from the institution to the language learner, and has accelerated the shift from scheduled group study in the language laboratory to individual study in surroundings most comfortable for the learner, at times convenient for the learner, and at the pace the learner finds best, but probably not in a row of students in a traditional language laboratory.

As individuals and teachers rely less on group study and teaching in the language laboratory, there is more emphasis on the ordering of the content of materials in the tapes so that they are more effective for individual study. Such materials are often supported with workbooks, which offer problems for solution and exercises for practice; frequently with self-correcting answer sheets that enhance their value for learners working at their own pace and without direct teacher supervision.

This shift of the burden of learning from the classroom teacher to the learner, and away from the traditional language laboratory does not mean that the teacher time and institutional space will be saved; rather, the ultimate saving of time requires much more time from skilled teachers or teams of teachers and materials planners to make effective use of the learner's time. The spaces in which language learning takes place are becoming differently distributed, but still require that equipment be available, well-maintained, and secure, and the learning spaces adequately maintained.

2.13 Language Centers in America

Many language needs can be met within the regular academic year with the facilities of existing programs, but some, more specialized requirements have demands that cannot be met from our routine offerings.

The national need for an intensive year-long program in Chinese available to the academic community has been substantially met by the successful and regularly over-subscribed Full Year Asian Language Concentration (FALCON) offered at Cornell.

Intensive summer programs are offered at a small number of institutions in different areas of the country. Some of these are integrated into the regular academic year programs, and are of the same quality as the regular programs; some must still overcome the fact that summer programs are perceived by some students to be lightweight academic vacation periods. Strong summer programs provide us with the amplification we require to meet the professional and academic needs of our most able and ambitious students. However, for students in institutions that are not able to staff a Chinese language program during the academic year, the benefits of an intensive summer are often lost without an opportunity to maintain their language skills. Institutional arrangements for part-time language teachers, partial credit for part-time courses, and informal meetings of students with language interests can provide a valuable continuation of intensive summer work. These arrangements are difficult to fund at national levels, but represent a low-cost commitment that should be borne by institutions unable to make the substantial commitments required to fund a full language program. Careful local management should develop a wide-spread, perhaps cooperative, network of individuals who would make better use of the regular summer and academic year offerings of larger institutions.

Some institutions that do offer academic-year programs in Chinese do not have regular summer sessions, and make use of the summer session at other American or overseas institutions. The most successful of these select students carefully, arrange for supervision by staff member competent in Chinese, and offer a rigorous, but varied program of language learning activities. Such programs may vary their institutional affiliation depending on the effectiveness of instruction or other factors, or may become influential in shaping the curricula at summer sessions to which they send students. Examples of such programs are the Middlebury Summer Chinese School, administered separately from the academic year program, and the summer program at the University of Pennsylvania, which has been able in recent years to make use of unfilled spaces in the Inter-University Program on Taiwan.

2.14 Overseas Language Centers

There is a small number of centers for Chinese language instruction overseas that have been so closely identified with successful language instruction of our students that they must be considered as part of our national language teaching resources. Since many of the best teachers in these overseas programs continue to be invited to take up teaching posts in America, they are a source for our teachers. These institutions exist in Chinese-speaking communities where both language and the culture for which it is a vehicle make up a more comprehensive language experience than can be supplied in any institution in the West. After two or three years of language study in the U.S., the student has been equipped to make full use of this experience.

The most influential of these is the Inter-University Center, housed at National Taiwan University, and administered by Stanford University; others are located at the Taiwan Normal University, Fu Jen University, Yale-China in Hong Kong, and Nanyang University in Singapore.

In general, these institutions offer instruction that is likely to be one-on-one, but also likely to be slightly lower in quality than that offered in America, partly because the best teachers come here, and partly because they are out of touch with advances in teaching. This situation has not changed over the past decade: our best students and scholars continue to work with less skilled teachers at a time when they are having their most significant exposure to Chinese culture.

With expanding opportunities for cultural exchange with China, the teaching and scholarship resources in China will become increasingly available to our students. Currently however, only a limited number of opportunities for advanced scholars and researchers are available through the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China.

In time, the Beijing Language Institute will become more important to students from America, but BLI will first have to recover from the shock of loss of many of its finest teachers who have been sent to staff new language programs in Europe and Africa, and from the growing pains that have developed from the expansion of its curricular offerings from one to four years, with major reassignment of experienced staff members. Other programs for training foreigners which are under development at a number of universities in China may also become valuable resources for us.

For all of these institutions, those of proven effectiveness and those of great potential value, enlightened self-interest mandates that we make every effort to help improve the quality of instruction in every way that we are able.

2.15 Endnotes for Chinese Language Teaching in the U.S.: The State of the Art - A Retrospective View

1. This title is modelled on my earlier Chinese Language Teaching in the United States: The State of the Art Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1968. ERIC ED 020 525.

2. For a discussion of the employment of area studies graduates in general, see Berryman, Sue E. and others. Foreign language and International Studies Specialists: The Marketplace and National Policy. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1979, ERIC: FL 010 986. See also several papers in the topic in President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies: Background Papers and Studies, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979. ERIC FL 010 916

3. Bodman, Nicholas C. "Chinese," in Conference on Critical Language in Liberal Arts Colleges. Washington D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1965, pp. 18-29.

4. Johnson, Dora E. et al. Languages of Eastern Asia (Survey of Materials for the Study of the Uncommonly Taught Languages, No. 5). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1976, pp. 1-19.

5. For an extended description of these materials, see Wrenn, James J. (forthcoming in the Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association).

6. Association for Asian Studies, Committee on East Asian Libraries, Library Resources on East Asia, Switzerland, Inter Documentation Company, AG, 1968, pp. 92,3.

7. 'Current Status of East Asian Collections in American Libraries--A Note on the Final Version' p. 47, in: Committee on East Asian Libraries Newsletter, Volume 50, May 1976.

8. Ibid.

3.0 Survey Population and Respondents

3.1 Rate of Response

The long form of our survey questionnaire was mailed to 180 institutions of higher education in the United States that our preliminary investigations had told us were teaching Chinese. We had begun with a longer list of 250 institutions that we thought might be teaching Chinese (see Appendix A for details). Table 2 (on page 20) shows a return rate of 61.7% for all institutional categories for the long survey form. Given the length and detail of our questionnaire, we feel quite pleased with the high rates of return for all institutional categories. No doubt a contributing factor to this high rate of return was our procedure of identifying an individual by name on each campus who, because of having been identified and contacted previously, would therefore feel more committed to the return of the questionnaire.

For the 70 institutions (of the orginal 250 identified) that reported to us that they had no functioning Chinese language instructional program as of the date of our survey, we attempted to discover the reasons for this abandonment. Section 3.3 below is an analysis of 25 responses which we received to our inquiry concerning the nature of the abandoned program and reasons for their abandonment.

Five of the 180 programs surveyed with our long questionnaire and 11 of the 70 "non-programs" turned out to be self-instructional programs of Chinese, frequently managed according to procedures established by the National Association for Self-Instructional Language Programs (NASILP). Programs operating in this mode exhibit special characteristics: the returns of our self-study survey are discussed in detail in Section 7.7, below. Rate of return for our small self-study survey for Chinese is shown in Table 3.

In all, we contacted 191 institutions with our two survey forms, 180 institutions with the long one, and 16 (including five from the long-form group) with the self-instruction one. We received returns from 125 institutions, for an overall return rate of 65.4%.

3.2 Institution Types

We consider it essential to reflect the diversity of types of institution in American higher education in the analysis and display of information collected in our survey. We have used the institutional categories defined by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) adding only one institution type to our analysis: programs of Chinese language instruction which are carried out at institutions housing a Far Eastern language and area center (NDEA center) funded by the United States Office of Education. Most of the Tables included in the Report subdivide the responses into the following categories:

TABLE 2

RATE OF RETURN OF LONG SURVEY FORM, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	NDEA Center	Large Univ.	Small Univ.	4-year College	2-year College	No AAUP Category	TOTALS
No. institutions on mailing list	17	72	49	22	12	4	180
No. usable returns received	12	46	28	14	11	0	111
Percent return	70.6%	63.9%	57.1%	63.6%	91.7%	0%	61.7%

TABLE 3

RATE OF RETURN OF SELF-STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	NDEA Center	Large Univ.	Small Univ.	4-year College	2-year College	TOTALS
No. institutions on mailing list	0	6	4	5	1	16
No. usable returns received	0	5	4	4	1	14
Percent return	0%	83.3%	100%	80%	100%	87.5%

NDEA Centers--Institutions housing either a graduate or an undergraduate federally funded language and area studies program.

Large Universities--Institutions which offer the doctoral degree and which conferred in the most recent three years an annual average of 15 or more earned doctorates covering a minimum of three non-related disciplines.

Small Universities--Institutions awarding degrees above the baccalaureate, but not included in the preceding two categories.

Four-Year Colleges--Institutions awarding the baccalaureate or equivalent degree.

Two-Year Colleges --Two-year institutions with academic ranks.*

3.3 Why Institutions Drop Chinese Language Instruction

Abandoning Chinese language instruction is not a phenomenon restricted to a particular type of institution. Among the 25 responses we received to our letter requesting information about the reasons for program abandonment, 22 are from four-year colleges and universities, while 3 are from two-year colleges. These institutions are evenly distributed across the country; several are well-known, well-endowed universities.

The commitment of a number of these institutions to Chinese language instruction is obviously not great: Chinese language courses were reported to have been conducted by faculty members from English and Physical Education departments, while 3 schools indicated that graduate students from departments other than foreign language departments had been responsible for instruction. Only two of the abandoned programs had been conducted by foreign language departments, while 7 institutions reported that classes had been conducted through an East Asian area studies program. This last result is surprising since Chinese language study is normally considered a rather high priority in institutions with such area studies programs.

Fifteen out of 25 respondents indicated that the reason for dropping Chinese instruction was the lack of sufficient student enrollment. The definition of "sufficient enrollment" varies considerably by institution, however. For some institutions, a half-dozen students were insufficient to justify the offering of a course; for some other institutions, 30 students were not enough to justify the existence of a beginning Chinese course. Four institutions cited lack of funds, unrelated to student enrollment, as the reason for dropping their Chinese language courses. One of these indicated that despite adequate enrollment, the program had to be abandoned when federal funding terminated and the university could not absorb the continuing cost of the program. One California institution was forced to drop its Chinese language instruction because of passage of Proposition Thirteen. In four cases, program abandonment was due to lack of faculty. Three of these schools explained that when faculty members left, they were not replaced because of institution-wide pressure to reduce staffing levels.

---

*Quoted--with the exception of the first definition--from "Explanation of Statistical Data by Institution," AAUP Bulletin 64, No. 3 (September 1978), p. 211. All NDEA Centers are, by AAUP definition, large universities. For purposes of this study, however, NDEA centers have been placed in a separate category.

With regard to the future of Chinese language instruction in these 25 institutions, 5 indicated that they had definite plans for classes in Chinese to be resumed in fall 1979. Nine said that they would indeed offer Chinese again given adequate enrollment levels and necessary funding. Seven institutions said that they would not begin classes because they were doubtful of the availability of funding. Four institutions did not respond to this question.

The picture which has just been painted shows the potentially ephemeral nature of instruction in a curricular area that can only be called "marginal" on a large proportion of American campuses. The offering of even a smattering of Chinese frequently depends, therefore, upon the presence of a faculty member who is willing to teach an overload, or a graduate student willing to assume teaching responsibilities either gratis or for a small fee (see Section 7.7), or a group of students willing to agitate for Chinese instruction and large enough to assure a minimum enrollment.

4.0 Enrollments and Degrees Awarded

4.1 Data From Modern Language Association Surveys.

Since 1959, the Modern Language Association of America has been collecting enrollment data in foreign language studies from the registrars of American colleges and universities. For the purposes of the present study, we have gathered MLA data for enrollments in Chinese from the four most recent MLA surveys, conducted in 1970, '72, '74, and '77. These data, reproduced in Table 4 on page 25, reflect the rapid growth in Chinese enrollments from 1970 to 1974: an increase in total enrollment of approximately 56% over these four years. During this time, enrollments in Chinese at 2-year institutions almost tripled, undergraduate enrollments at four-year institutions grew by 70%, and graduate enrollments increased by almost 40%. By 1977, however, the MLA data show overall enrollments down by slightly over 7%, with graduate enrollments having decreased by more than 30% over those of 1974, and only enrollments in 2-year colleges on the increase.

4.2 Data from CAL Survey: Enrollments in Fall 1974, '77, '78.

In addition to requesting fall 1978 enrollments in Chinese language courses in Chinese language instructional programs, we requested that our respondents furnish us enrollment figures also for fall 1977 and fall 1974. (See Table 5 on page 26). We did this in the hope that we would be able to compare the enrollment statistics we obtained with those obtained by the Modern Language Association in fall 1977 and fall 1974. Our hypothesis was that the MLA figures reflect enrollments not only in Chinese language, but also in such courses as Chinese literature in translation and other non-language courses which are given by Chinese language faculty.

Although the overall rate of response to our questionnaire was quite good, as mentioned in the preceding section of this report, the fact that we did not achieve closer to a 100% return makes it difficult to compare our statistics with those of the MLA, which are based upon virtually a 100% return from the registrars whom they poll. The discrepancy is particularly large in the case of 2-year colleges: for fall 1977, the MLA survey reported 1,353 enrollments, whereas CAL survey respondents reported only 383. We suspect that this discrepancy is in part due to our not having discovered all the 2-year colleges teaching Chinese in the original search to establish our mailing list (see Table 2). Another reason is that one 2-year college in California that reported almost 500 enrollments in 1977 (more than 35% of the MLA-reported for 2-year colleges that year-see Table 4), did not fill out our long questionnaire but did indicate that about 250 students were enrolled in Chinese as of fall 1978.

The CAL sample respresents 61.7% of those institutions teaching Chinese (see Table 2). This group reported enrollments of 4,891 students in fall 1977; estimated enrollments for all institutions teaching Chinese would be then 7,927, compared with the 9,809 enrollments reported by the MLA for fall 1977 (see Table 4). One might hypothesize that the discrepancy between these two figures, 1992 enrollments, is the number of enrollments in courses about Chinese given in English.

TABLE 4

MLA SURVEY DATA: ENROLLMENTS IN CHINESE REPORTED BY COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY REGISTRARS

	Undergraduate		Graduate	TOTALS
	Two-yr. Institution	Four-yr. Institution		
1970	381	4,898	796	6,775
1972	890	7,867	1,201	9,958
1974	1,140	8,328	1,108	10,576
1977	1,353	7,698	758	9,809

TABLE 5

CAL SURVEY DATA: ENROLLMENTS IN CHINESE REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS FROM CHINESE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

	Undergraduate		Graduate	TOTALS
	Two-yr. Institution	Four-year Institution		
1974	208	3,979	737	4,914
1977	383	3,876	632	4,891
1978	469	4,316	697	5,382

The CAL survey enrollment figures, despite the deficiencies due to less than a 100% return that we have just discussed, provide two pieces of information concerning trends in Chinese enrollments. First, the CAL survey results corroborate overall trends in enrollments between 1974 and 1977 as reported in the MLA statistics. That is, there were fairly small decreases in both graduate enrollments and enrollments in 4-year institutions between 1974 and 1977, at the same time that enrollments in 2-year institutions were increasing slightly. Secondly, this enrollment trend was reversed between fall 1977 and fall 1978, with fairly substantial increases in undergraduate enrollments in both 2- and 4-year institutions as well as in graduate enrollments. These increases in enrollments, it must be remembered, took place before the impact of normalization with the People's Republic of China could have been felt.

4.3 Enrollments in "language learning" and "language using" courses: Fall 1974, '77, '78

In the CAL survey form, a distinction was made between language-learning and language-using courses. The former term is used to refer to courses where the primary intent is to develop language proficiency; the latter refers to courses conducted in Chinese about literature, linguistics, history, philosophy, etc. It was reasoned that enrollments in language-using courses would be a good indication of the development of functional language ability in Chinese on the part of students. Table 6 on page 28 displays the returns obtained from survey respondents.

For the most part, enrollments in language-using courses are quite small in comparison to total enrollments, ranging between 6% and 15%, with a mean of approximately 12%. This is true for all undergraduate courses, be they located in institutions having an NDEA area studies center, a major university without an area study center, a college or university offering advanced degrees in a limited number of displines, or a 4-year institution granting only the bachelors degree.

An encouraging trend may be noted, however, in the precentage of overall enrollments in language-using courses. In virtually all types of institutions, the percentage of enrollment in language-using courses is increasing slightly with the passage of time. For instance, in 1974, language-using courses constituted approximately 9% of total enrollments; by 1978, the percentage had risen to approximately 12%. In four-year colleges, enrollments in language-using courses are approximately 7% of the total; in 1978, they were approximately 10%.

One might assume that a much higher percentage of graduate enrollments might be in courses of the language-using type. This, in fact turns out to be the case in large universities, smaller ones, and four-year colleges. We hypothesize that the graduate students whose enrollments are being reported here are chiefly studying language and literature, and are therefore obtaining a level of competence in Chinese language which will permit them to receive their instruction in Chinese. For example, in the institutions just mentioned, the percentage of enrollments in language-using courses varies from about 25% to almost 40%.

TABLE 6

LANGUAGE LEARNING (LL) AND LANGUAGE USING (LU) ENROLLMENTS, BY INSTITUTION TYPE AND YEAR (QUESTION A-1).

		Undergraduate			Graduate			TOTALS		
Type	Year	LL	LU	TOT	LL	LU	TOT	LL	LU	TOT
NDEA Centers	1974	1193	124	1317	451	32	483	1644	156	1800
	1977	892	135	1027	354	40	394	1246	175	1421
	1978	1056	154	1210	387	61	448	1443	215	1658
Large Univ.	1974	1317	150	1467	116	60	176	1433	210	1643
	1977	1357	189	1546	100	33	133	1457	222	1679
	1978	1362	244	1606	99	42	141	1461	286	1747
Small Univ.	1974	875	57	932	44	27	71	919	84	1003
	1977	923	84	1007	71	28	99	994	112	1106
	1978	962	81	1043	75	29	104	1037	110	1247
Four-year College	1974	235	18	263	5	2	7	240	20	270
	1977	261	35	296	4	2	6	265	37	302
	1978	321	36	357	4	0	4	325	36	361
Two-year College	1974	208	0	208	0	0	0	208	0	208
	1977	383	0	383	0	0	0	383	0	383
	1978	459	10	469	0	0	0	459	10	469
Totals	1974	3828	349	4177	616	121	737	4444	470	4914
	1977	3816	443	4259	529	103	632	4345	546	4891
	1978	4160	525	4685	565	132	697	4725	657	5382

The situation is very different in institutions housing NDEA area studies centers. These institutions, which include the vast majority of graduate students studying Chinese language, show only between 7% and 14% of their graduate Chinese enrollments in language-using courses. Probably the reason for this low percentage, when compared with the other institutions in Table 6, is that graduate students in area studies centers tend not to be concentrating on Chinese language and/or literature, but rather advanced work in one of the social sciences. The fact that the percentage of enrollments in language-using courses by graduate students in area studies centers increased from about 7% of the 1974 total graduate enrollments in Chinese language in our sample, to about 14% of total enrollments in 1978, indicates that language competence of these students may be on the rise. We will return to the question of language competence of area specialists in section 8 of this report.

4.4 Enrollments in all courses dealing with Chinese language during academic year 1978-1979.

In addition to the information just discussed concerning enrollments in fall 1974, 1977, and 1978, the CAL questionnaire sought information about enrollments in the whole range of courses in Chinese language that were offered in academic year 1978-1979. Respondents were asked to list enrollments in courses offered during summer 1978 as well. Table 7 on page 30 displays this information.

If the returns from our survey are representative of the total population, we may draw two conclusions about the Chinese language instruction in this country based upon the information in Table 7. First of all, the largest portion of Chinese instruction does not take place in NDEA language and area centers; it takes place in large universities which do not have such centers. Secondly, the fact that about 30% of the course enrollments reported by large universities for academic year 1978-1979 are actually enrollments in courses in English about Chinese confirms our hypothesis (see Section 4.2) that a fairly substantial portion of MLA-reported Chinese enrollments are actually enrollments in courses conducted in English.

It appears that only a very small amount of Chinese study is done during the summertime and in extension courses.

The information contained in Table 7 enables us to make some inferences about "attrition" in Chinese language study. This term is used to designate the enrollment decrease in a multi-year sequence of courses. In order to perform a truly legitimate study of attrition, one would have to approach the question longitudinally, beginning with a group of students in first year Chinese, and noting their subsequent progress (or lack of it for those who leave the program) through what in this case is a 4-year sequence of courses. We were not able to do such a longitudinal study for this report, and instead are inferring from enrollment patterns during one academic year what might happen over 4 years. This, of course, can only be considered an indication of the actual rates of attrition over time. During academic year 1978-1979, enrollments in first-year Chinese for our respondents totaled 4,706; for second year Chinese, enrollments were 2,215, or 41% of those in first year. Enrollments in fourth year Chinese were 882, or approximately 19% of those in

TABLE 7

UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE ENROLLMENTS IN CHINESE COURSES DURING ACADEMIC YEAR 1978-79 (INCLUDING SUMMER 1978), BY INSTITUTION TYPE, WITH PERCENT OF FIRST YEAR ENROLLMENT (QUESTION A-2)*

Course Type	NDEA Center		Lge. Univ.		Small Univ.		4-yr. coll.		2-yr. coll.		TOTALS	
	No.	% 1st Year	No.	% 1st Year	No.	% 1st Year	No.	% 1st Year	No.	% 1st Year	No.	% 1st year
First yr. Chinese lang.	1288	-	1767	-	891	-	295	-	465	-	4706	-
Second yr. Chinese lang.	530	41%	968	55%	554	62%	116	39%	47	10%	2215	47%
Third yr. Chinese lang.	565	44%	429	24%	150	17%	86	29%	14	02%	1244	26%
Fourth yr. Chinese lang.	342	27%	401	23%	129	14%	10	03%	0	0	882	19%
Summer Chinese lang.	161		405		66		65		0		697	
Courses in English	411		1754		192		229		0		2586	
Extension courses	63		49		5		0		46		163	

*The enrollment percentages do not reflect what happens to individual students but simply illustrate that there is a drop in enrollment after the first year.

first year. If the proportions just mentioned of enrollments in second and fourth years to enrollments in first year correspond to attrition rates for these two years in Chinese studies, Chinese language students are showing themselves to be about as persevering as students of the more commonly-taught languages in the second year, and quite a bit more persevering than students of the commonly-taught languages by the fourth year.

The proportion of second year students to first year students varies considerably by institution type. NDEA centers and large universities have approximately 41% and 55%, respectively, as many students in second year as in first. Small universities, however, have a surprisingly high 62%, while four-year colleges have only 39%. Two-year colleges report only 10% of their first year enrollment are taking second-year Chinese. For NDEA centers and large universities, enrollments in fourth-year Chinese were 27% and 23%, respectively,of those in first year. This is a very low rate of attrition, when compared with enrollments in the commonly taught languages.

While the figures in Table 7 represent both graduate and undergraduate enrollments, it is interesting to compare them to the estimated attrition rate reported by our respondents for their undergraduate students; Table 8 presents this information.

Two-year colleges indicate that 51% of their first year Chinese students continue on to take second year; Table 7 shows that in actuality this appears to be an extremely optimistic view, since enrollments in second year Chinese were only 10% of those in first year. Respondents from four-year colleges were also overly optimistic about the percentage of students continuing to second year Chinese; they indicated that 64% of their first-year students continued on, while Table 7 shows that enrollments in second year Chinese were 39% those of first year. And, while these same respondents estimated that 26% of their first-year students continued on through fourth year, Table 7 shows that actual fourth year enrollments were only 3% of those in first year during academic year 1978-1979. With only a very few exceptions, respondents from NDEA centers and large and small universities were considerably more realistic about the percentage of their first year students who went on to study Chinese for 2, 3, or 4 years.

4.5 Anticipated enrollment trends and estimated impact of normalization with the People's Republic of China.

Respondents were asked to anticipate enrollment trends in Chinese language instruction at their institutions at both the undergraduate and graduate levels over the next five years. Only 3.6% reported that they foresaw a decrease in undergraduate enrollment in Chinese language, and 13.5% thought that enrollments would stay the same. Fully 61% responded that they thought enrollments would increase slightly over the next five years, with at least half of all institution types responding that this would be the case at their own institution. Approximately 19% of the responding institutions indicated that they thought Chinese language enrollments would increase by 50% or more over the next five years. Of the institutions indicating this anticipated large growth, two presently house USOE-funded area centers, 12 are large universities without

TABLE 8

ATTRITION RATE FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS, AVERAGED BY INSTITUTION TYPE. (QUESTION D-3).

Of Students enrolled in first year Chinese	NDEA Ctrs.	Lge. Univ.	Small Univ.	4-yr. Coll.	2-yr. Coll.
% finish 2nd year	54%	48%	56%	64%	51%
% finish 3rd year	31	29	37	53	--
% finish 4th year	17	24	41	26	--

area centers, 4 are small universities, 2 are BA-granting institutions, and 1 is a 2-year college.

With respect to graduate enrollments, of the 52 institutions indicating that they had graduate students currently enrolled, 32, or 62%, thought that graduate enrollments would increase slightly over the next 5 years. Seventeen (33%) believed that enrollments would stay about the same over the next 5 years. Only two institutions reported that they thought that graduate enrollments would increase by 50% or more.

In response to a question about evidence of increased interest in Chinese language study because of the recent normalization of relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China, 72% of our respondents indicated that they had experienced more interest on the part of students, 39% indicated that they had seen more interest from business or professional people who desired to learn some Chinese, and 32% mentioned that the administration of their institution had expressed some interest in Chinese language instruction. Only 12% said that they had seen no such evidence and less than 4% said that it was too early to tell.

4.6 Degrees Awarded During Calendar Year 1978

Table 9 on page 34 shows that less than one-third (32%) of the institutions teaching Chinese included in our sample offer an undergraduate degree or a concentration in Chinese language. As one might expect, the proportion of NDEA centers offering an undergraduate degree in Chinese (73%) is substantially larger than that exhibited in other institutional categories. But it is surprising to us that 3 NDEA centers, according to our returns, do not have an undergraduate major or concentration relating to Chinese. On the other end of the spectrum, only 1 of 11 two-year colleges in our sample offers a degree in Chinese. The proportion of institutions offering undergraduate degrees or certificate programs in Chinese for the other institutional categories lies between these two extremes, as indicated in Table 9. Of the thirty-five institutions reporting the existence of an undergraduate degree program or concentration, four offer two separate undergraduate degree programs in Chinese, and one offers three separate programs.

During calendar year 1978, 134 undergraduate degrees or certificates in Chinese were conferred by the institutions in our sample (see Table 10 on page 35). The largest number of these degrees (44) were awarded by institutions housing NDEA centers, though large universities without such centers were not far behind in this regard (42 degrees conferred). Although NDEA centers awarded the highest average number of undergraduate degrees per institution (slightly over 6) during 1978, the number of degrees awarded by small universities is not much lower: 5 degrees conferred per institution.

Only eighteen institutions of the total number responding in our survey award graduate degrees in Chinese. As one might guess, the great majority of these are NDEA centers and large universities (see Table 11 on page 36). During calendar year 1978 a total of 29 graduate degrees were awarded by 13 institutions, of which 21 came from NDEA center institutions and other large universities (see Table 12 on page 37).

TABLE 9

UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES AND CONCENTRATIONS IN CHINESE OFFERED BY RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS, BY INSTITUTION TYPE (QUESTION A-5)

Degree Name	NDEA Ctrs.	Lge. Univ.	Small Univ.	4-yr. Coll.	2-yr. Coll.	TOTAL
AA in Chinese	0	0	0	0	1	1
BA (no further designation)	5	3	1	1	0	10
BA in Chinese lang/lit.	2	8	3	1	0	14
BA in Chinese/Asian/Oriental area studies	1	4	0	0	0	5
Less than major, Chinese lang.	0	1	2	0	0	3
Less than major, Chinese area studies	0	0	1	1	0	2
No major (or defined less than major) program	3	30	21	9	10	73
TOTALS	11	46	28	12	11	108*

*Three institutions in our sample did not respond to this question.

TABLE 10

UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES AWARDED AND NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS AWARDING DEGREES IN CALENDAR YEAR 1978, BY INSTITUTION TYPE.

(QUESTION A-5)

Institution Type	NDEA Ctrs.	Lge. Univ.	Small Univ.	4-yr. Coll.	2-yr. Coll.	TOTAL
Number of institutions	7	13	5	3	1	29
Number of degree recipients	44	42	25	13	10	134

43

44

TABLE 11

GRADUATE DEGREES OFFERED BY RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS, BY INSTITUTION TYPE.

(QUESTION A-6)

	NDEA Ctrs.	Lge. Univ.	Small Univ.	4-yr. Coll.	TOTAL
M.A. in Chinese	1	3	–	–	4
M.A. in Chinese Studies	1	–	–	1*	2
M.A., unspecified	3	2	1	–	6
M.A. & Ph.D. in Chinese	–	–	1	–	1
M.A. and Ph.D. in Chinese Studies	–	2	–	–	2
M.A. and Ph.D. in Linguistics	1	1	–	–	2
M.A. and Ph.D., unspecified	1	–	–	–	1
Ph.D. in Chinese	–	1	–	–	1
Ph.D., Chinese literature	1	–	–	–	1
Ph.D. in Comparative literature	–	1	–	–	1
Ph.D., unspecified	1	1	–	–	2
Number of institutions offering graduate degrees					18**

---

* This institution is obviously mis-categorized in the AAUP classification system, since the AAUP classification for 4-year colleges does not include institutions awarding graduate degrees.

** Five institutions offer two different graduate degrees, so the sum of the tallies in this column is 23, though only 18 institutions award advanced degrees.

TABLE 12

GRADUATE DEGREES AWARDED AND NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS AWARDING DEGREES IN CALENDAR YEAR 1978, BY INSTITUTION TYPE (QUESTION A-6)

Institution Type	NDEA Ctrs.	Lge. Univ.	Small Univ.	4-yr. Coll.	TOTAL
No. Institutions	5	5	2	1	13
No. degree recipients	11	10	7	1	29

5.0 Chinese Language Instructors: Who are they?

5.1 Introduction

Academic institutions in the United States exhibit a variety of titles for instructional staff. In order to attempt to "standarize" our responses, we defined for our respondents four categories of teaching staff that our discussions with members of the field led us to believe represented the full range of different responsibilities for instruction in Chinese language teaching. The definitions which we included on our survey form are as follows:

1) Teaching Assistant (TA): a graduate teaching assistant, pursuing a post-baccalaureate degree while teaching part-time. (Our questionnaire continued to state that TA's are usually not native speakers of Chinese; the data recorded below will show that this was an incorrect assumption.)

2) Tutor: does not carry responsiblity for instruction; rather, works with students individually or in small groups, usually under the supervision of an instructor/professor. Likely to be part-time; likely to be a native speaker of Chinese.

3) Lecturer: non-tenure track position on a fixed-year contract, either working under the direction of an instructor/professor or working autonomously. In the former case, a lecturer carries more responsibility for instruction than does a tutor; in the latter case, a lecturer can be totally responsible for instruction. Frequently less than full-time; frequently a native speaker of Chinese.

4) Instructor/Professor: usually a tenure track position. Responsible for course development and for instruction, including the coordination of the efforts of lecturers, tutors, and TA's.

Our questionnaire requested quite detailed information about teachers of Chinese. In addition to simply listing the different kinds of teaching staff at an institution, according to the above-cited categories, respondents were asked to list the names of instructional personnel, their sex, age, rank, number of years at present institution, tenure status, percent full time, and highest relevant degree. With these data we anticipated being able to draw a profile of the kinds of individuals teaching Chinese, and to be able to answer questions such as the following: Are Chinese language teachers (as contrasted with literature, civilization, or area studies teachers) likely to be female, to be non-tenured, to be less than full-time, and to have not received an MA or PhD? Are a significant number of Chinese language teachers reaching retirement age, so that we might expect a greater turnover in instructional personnel than has been the case over the past decade?

Althought quite a few respondents went to considerable lengths to furnish us with complete data of the type just discussed, not enough did so to make analysis of these questions possible. We did succeed, however, in obtaining good information about the number and proportion of native speakers

TABLE 13

NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE CHINESE LANGUAGE TEACHERS, BY INSTITUTION TYPE
(QUESTION B-1)

	NDEA Center	Large Univ.	Small Univ.	4-year College	2-year College	TOTAL
Teaching Assistants						
Native	28	32	6	2	0	68
Non-Native	7	11	2	2	0	22
Total	35	43	8	4	0	90
Tutors						
Native	4	9	1	6	7	27
Non-Native	1	2	0	0	1	4
Total	5	11	1	6	8	31
Lecturers						
Native	32	16	12	9	5	74
Non-Native	6	0	0	0	0	6
Total	38	16	12	9	5	80
Instructors/Professors						
Native	35	44	22	10	8	119
Non-Native	24	32	10	2	2	70
Total	59	76	32	12	10	189
Total Native Staff	99	101	41	27	20	288
Total Non-Native Staff	35	45	12	4	3	99
Total Staff	134	146	53	31	23	387
Average Staff per institution	10.3	3.2	1.9	2.2	2.1	3.5

of Chinese in the various instructional categories defined above, identified by instutional type. This information is displayed in Table 13 on page 39.

One quick glance at the totals in this table shows that almost three quarters of the instructional staff teaching Chinese in the United States today are native-speaking Chinese: 288 native Chinese out of a total of 387 teachers of Chinese language in our sample. The lower ranking instructional positions of tutor and lecturer are occupied almost exclusively by native-speakers of Chinese: 27 out of 31 tutors in our sample are native Chinese, as are 74 out of 80 lecturers. Tenure-track positions, on the other hand, are much more likely to be held by non-native speakers of Chinese: 37% of the instructor-professor positions in our sample are held by non-native speakers of Chinese, while the respective proportions for lecturers and tutors are 7% (6 out of a total 80) and 13% (4 out of a total 31).

Table 13 underlines graphically the huge difference in staffing levels between the NDEA Center institutions and all others, including the major universities. On the average, NDEA Centers employ more than ten teachers of Chinese language per institution; the next largest language teaching staffs are found in large universities without centers, which average slightly over 3 teachers per institution. Other types of institutions average about 2 faculty members teaching Chinese per institution (though there are many institutions with a single individual teaching Chinese). The overall average is 3.5 Chinese language instructors per institution.

5.2 Instructional responsibilities of staff, by category

The intent of our questions concerning staff responsibilities was to discover whether the standard mode of staff utilization in the "commonly taught" language, (i.e. TA's and lower seniority instructional personnel assigned to elementary and intermediate level classes, with senior personnel teaching more advanced courses), was also practiced in the teaching of Chinese.

The vast majority of institutions employing TA's for Chinese language teaching are either NDEA Centers or large universities without NDEA Centers. In both of these kinds of institutions, we find that TA's are used not only to teach intensive and non-intensive first and second year Chinese, but also to teach third and fourth year Chinese.

Only about 25% of our respondents employ Chinese language teachers who fit our description of "tutor." They are most numerous in large universities where they are responsible for Chinese language instruction from the first through the third years. NDEA Centers also employ a small number of such teachers; they also are responsible for first through third year Chinese language instruction. Small universities, 4-year colleges, and 2-year colleges employ very few language teachers fitting our "tutor" definition; in these institutions, tutors are chiefly responsible for first year language instruction.

Approximately two-thirds of the NDEA Centers employ Chinese language teachers fitting our definition of "lecturer." They are responsible for elementary through fourth year language instruction. The pattern appears to be different for large universities without NDEA Centers, about half of which employ lecturers, who teach only first and second year language. In 4-year colleges, approximately two thirds of which employ such staff, they are responsible for the first through the third years of instruction.

In NDEA centers, instructor/professors teach everything from first year through fourth year Chinese language. Such is not the case, however, at large universities not having NDEA Centers; at about 70% of these institutions, instructor/professors teach first year Chinese language. Slightly more than 60% teach second year, slightly more than 50% teach third and fourth year Chinese language. About half of the smaller universities indicated that instructor/professors teach Chinese language courses from first through third year. For fourth year, the percentage is somewhat lower, slightly over 30%. Almost 70% of the 4-year colleges report that instructor/professors teach first and second year Chinese language. About 50% report that instructors teach third and fourth year Chinese. Eight out of nine two-year colleges stated that instructor/professors teach first year Chinese. Only five reported that instructor/professors teach second year Chinese language.

We conclude from these data that staffing patterns for Chinese language instruction are somewhat different than those for the commonly taught languages, where staff with less seniority tend to teach only lower division courses. As we have seen just above, lower-level staff frequently teach third year and fourth year Chinese language. This is particularly true with respect to the teaching assignments of TA's in NDEA Centers and large universities. In addition, particularly in NDEA Centers, we find that instructor/professors are teaching not only the more advanced classes but also the lower level courses as well. It is likely that these staffing patterns stem from the fact that Chinese language teaching tends to be done by native speakers, whether they are TA's or tenured personnel.

5.3 Hiring Practices and Prospects

Respondents were asked whether they evaluate the competence in Chinese language of potential staff members. Overall, about 71% of the respondents said that some sort of evaluation was performed. Responding in the affirmative were 85% of the NDEA Centers, 76% of the large universities, 67% of the small universitites, 64% of the 4-year colleges, and 55% of the two-year colleges. There is further evidence that NDEA Centers are more careful to evaluate their incoming staff than are other types of institutions. For instance, 82% of the NDEA Centers responded that teaching assistants' language competence was evaluated, while for the large universities, the proportion was 67%. For the other types of institutions using teaching assistants, (small universities and BA-granting institutions), the percentage was closer to 50%. Only 8% of the NDEA Centers indicated that they do not evaluate incoming instructor/professors. For large universities, the corresponding percentage was 47%; for small universities, 26%; for 4-year colleges, 43%; for two-year colleges, 27%.

A substantial proportion of institutions, 42%, verify competence in Chinese in at least two ways, and 20% check language competence in three ways. It is evident from our returns that some institutions are more careful to verify Chinese language competence than are others: 75% of NDEA Centers indicated that they check the competence of potential instructors in two ways, while only 43% of responding 4-year colleges did the same. Of the NDEA Centers, 50% indicated that they verified language competence three ways, while for small universities the corresponding percentage was 15%.

By far the most frequent type of verfication is the oral interview to assure that a native Chinese has an accent that will be compatible with the existing program; 56% of responding institutions indicated that such a verification is made. The next most frequently-used test is the oral interview to assure that a non-native has adequate control of oral Chinese; 40% of our respondents indicated that they used such procedures. Only 21% of our respondents require a writing sample to verify the potential instructor's ability to write Chinese characters. Other methods of evaluation were reported by 17% of our respondents.

With respect to the possibility of Chinese language teaching openings in tenure track positions, over the next five years about 55% of our respondents foresee none; a total of 38 openings are forecast by 26 different institutions, 21 of which predict they will have one opening only over the next five years. Five such openings were forecast by NDEA Centers, five by large universities without centers, seven by smaller universities, two in 4-year colleges, and two in two-year colleges.

Approximately 48% of our responding institutions foresee no opening over the next five years for Chinese language teachers on fixed-year contracts. Thirty-seven institutions indicated that they would likely be hiring at least one Chinese language instructor on a fixed-year contract over the next five years, the total number of possible openings being 12. A number of institutions appeared to be including openings for TA positions in this total. For the most part, institutions reported that only one fixed-year contract vacancy would occur; such was the case with two NDEA Centers, 12 large universities, 7 smaller universities, 3 four-year colleges, and 4 two-year colleges.

5.4 Pedagogical Training and Professional Development Opportunities

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they provide new teaching staff of all types (TA's, tutors, lecturers, instructor/professors) with an introduction to and training in the teaching methods of their particular program. Overall, 47% of our respondents indicated that they do provide some sort of introduction to their teaching approach and methods. By far the largest proportion of NDEA Centers provides this type of training for incoming language instructors; 10 out of 12 center respondents (83%) indicated that they provide some sort of pedagogical introduction. Approximately half this proportion of large and small universities provide such training to their incoming instructors; 46% for large universities, 44% for smaller ones. The proportion of four-year and two-year colleges providing such an introduction to methodology is smaller; about 36% for both types of institutions. While these statistics appear to underline impressively the NDEA Centers' commitment to quality in Chinese language instruction, it could be that, at least in part, the amount of attention paid to pedagogical introduction for new instructors stems from the fact that Chinese language instruction programs in NDEA Centers tend to have many more faculty than those in other institutions, hence the need to coordinate pedagogical approach among several instructors.

Virtually all respondents who indicated that some training was provided in their teaching methods described briefly what this training activity is. These comments reveal a wide diversity of approaches to teacher training, ranging from extremely perfunctory introductions to text and approach, to extensive course work, observation, and supervised teaching. Most frequently mentioned were, in order of frequency: 1) Discussion or course work in the methodology of Chinese language teaching. Although in most institutions this discussion appears not to be overly structured, several large departments offer courses in the methodology of teaching the Chinese language. 2) Class observation of experienced instructors was the second most frequently mentioned activity. 3) A practice teaching experience with supervision from experienced instructors was mentioned almost as frequently as class observation. A very small number of institutions require new instructors to take course work to prepare them for teaching; a larger number encourage new instructors to take such course work--for example, courses in Chinese linguistics.

Respondents were asked whether Chinese language teaching staff, regardless of level, are provided the opportunity to upgrade their pedagogical competence. Sixty-five percent indicated that some such opportunity was provided. Comments received were among the most voluminous on the questionnaire. Most respondents either implied or stated explicitly that the initiative for professional development rests with the individual instructor, though some (obviously responsible for large programs employing TA's or other subordinate instructors) describe extensive professional development programs. Only one respondent mentioned specifically that one criterion of faculty evaluation on that campus is the amount of time devoted to improvement of teaching.

The most frequently mentioned professional development experiences are off- or on-campus meetings, either informal staff meetings or more formalized seminars and workshops. Several on-campus programs sound particularly valuable; they typically involve weekly or bi-weekly meetings of instructional staff for the coordination of course content and discussion of instructional problems. Several such seminar programs involve the development of reading and audio-visual teaching materials.

It is a widely held opinion that many teachers of Chinese in the United States have been away from the Far East for a long enough period that their usage of Mandarin no longer corresponds to the current idiom. Furthermore, particularly until normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China, it was difficult if not impossible for a substantial proportion of Chinese language teachers in the United States to return to the mainland to refresh their knowledge of current idiomatic Mandarin. In order to document the need in this regard, we asked our respondents whether current teaching staff, regardless of level, are provided the opportunity to upgrade their knowledge of contemporary Chinese. Only 39% of our respondents were able to

TABLE 14

RANK ORDERS OF DESIRABLE CHANGES TO IMPROVE CHINESE LANGUAGE TEACHING ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES, IN PERCENTS OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS. (QUESTION D-24).

Possible Changes	First Priority	Second Priority	Third Priority	Total% Rankings 1-3
Better pedagogical training before teaching	19.8%	9.0%	4.5%	33.3%
Smaller classes	22.5%	6.3%	2.7%	31.5%
More natives as teachers	12.6%	12.6%	5.4%	27.6%
Better pedagogical training, TA's, tutors	5.4%	10.8%	8.1%	24.3%
More visiting pedagogical experts	9.0%	9.0%	5.4%	23.4%
Other	15.3%	2.7%	2.7%	20.7%
Missing	15.3%	9.0%	9.0%	
No second/third mention		40.5%	62.2%	

respond affirmatively to this question, and in their subsequent comments, it became clear that a sizable proportion of these was referring to workshop and conference experiences that involved no travel to the Far East. Overall, only about 25% of our respondents appeared to have been either to the People's Republic or Taiwan recently themselves or to have colleagues who have done so. With the rapid opening up of exchanges subsequent to normalization, however, it is to be hoped that increasing numbers of teachers of Chinese will have the opportunity to update their knowledge of current usage through a visit to China.

As another measure of the amount of professional development engaged in by today's teachers of Chinese, we asked for the number of language-teaching staff, at all levels, who were on leave doing research. Only 24% of our respondents (27 individuals), reported that a teacher of Chinese was currently on leave doing research. Of the twenty-six individuals referred to in respondents' comments on this question, 8 were pursuing literary research, 6 were pursuing linguistic research, 4 were developing materials, 4 were pursuing historical research, and 4 were pursuing research of an unspecified nature.

5.5 Instructor-Related Changes to Improve Chinese Language Instruction

Our respondents were given the opportunity to indicate from a list of options or to suggest their own instructor-related changes that they believed would do most to improve the quality of Chinese language teaching. Respondents were told to rank-order their choices; returns from this question are displayed in Table 14 on page 44. Although not the first priority of the largest proportion of our respondents, the most frequently mentioned priority was more thorough pedagogical training before beginning teaching for those who will be responsible for instruction, i.e., instructor/professors and lecturers. The second most frequently mentioned improvement overall was the need for smaller classes in language-learning courses during the first and second years of instruction, mentioned by 31.5% of our respondents. Other priorities are listed in Table 14. The most frequently-mentioned first priority of our respondents was the need for smaller classes. Most frequently-mentioned responses listed under "other" were: the need for more funding and more staff to accommodate the students presently enrolled, and the need for more accessible study abroad.

The most interesting and perhaps revealing result from this question is the large number of non-responses; 15.3% of respondents did not indicate any response for first priority; a total of 49.5% did not indicate any second priority; a total of 71.2% indicated no third priority. This low response rate leads one to question whether this matter is a central concern of a substantial number of our respondents. Of course it could also indicate that somehow we did not phrase our question correctly.

5.6 "Outreach" Activities of Faculty Members

By "outreach," we mean activities through which university faculty take their language and cultural expertise "off-campus" to provide services to the community at large for secondary or primary education; 40 institutions responded that they engage in some form of outreach activity, out of which 37 provided comments on the nature of these activities. Seven out of twelve NDEA Centers responding to our questionnaire (68%) reported engaging in some form of outreach activity. For large universities, small universities, and two-year colleges, approximately 35% of institutions reporting described some form of outreach activity. For 4-year colleges, the percentage was 14%.

The kind of outreach varies widely according to the institution's location: those located near sizable Chinese ethnic communities tend (as one would naturally expect) to have more active outreach programs than those which are not so situated. For the most part, Chinese staff members of those institutions that are not situated near Chinese communities give lectures, demonstrations, and slide shows on Chinese language, culture, art, history, and current events to local high schools, elementary schools, and interested community groups. In areas where interest is high, these presentations are frequent and numerous; in other places, as one respondent pointed out, "much more could be done if the invitations were available."

In the few areas where Chinese is taught in secondary schools (for example urban areas such as New York City, Boston, St. Louis and various locations in California), college and university faculty not only give the kinds of presentations just referred to but also work with high school Chinese teachers as well, by helping to coordinate programs, giving workshops, and developing materials. One respondent has taught Chinese to second-and third-graders. Five institutions reported offering Chinese outside the universities at off-campus satellite centers or in pilot Saturday schools. In a few cases, Chinese majors are sent to local schools to observe and assist teachers. Three institutions indicated that they participate in local high school contests in public speaking and composition.

The institutions located near Chinese communities are not only involved in educating the non-Chinese community about China and Chinese, but provide services for the local Chinese populace as well. For example, one institution located in New York City collaborates with a bilingual program in Chinatown. Several other institutions report that their faculty offer English classes or private tutoring for the native speakers of Chinese. Outreach is not limited to the purely academic; one institution, in addition to teaching at Chinese community schools, assists ethnic Chinese residents with their income tax returns.

6.0 Materials of Instruction

6.1 Textbooks in Current Usage

Tables 15 through 20, on pages 48 through 53, list the most commonly used textbook materials, as reported by our respondents, for first through fourth-year Chinese language instruction. For first and second years, we requested that our respondents list separately materials used for the basic text and for the introduction of Chinese characters. In some cases, the textbook in question does not fit nicely into our dichotomy (e.g., DeFrancis', Character Text for Beginning Chinese), and we have consolidated responses from both the basic text and the character-learning text categories. We also consolidated tabulations for series of volumes under one title, for example Wang and Chang's Read Chinese Books I, II, III.

As just mentioned, the texts listed in our tables are those cited most frequently by our respondents. Naturally, first and second-year texts were mentioned many more times than were third and fourth-year texts, since the latter courses are given in a smaller number of institutions to a smaller number of students. Tables 15 through 20 do not capture the wide diversity of text usage in all courses. For each one of the courses involved, at least ten different textbooks were reported in use by one or two individuals; rather than list these here, we refer the reader to the extensive list of materials for Chinese language instruction in Johnson et al., A Survey of Materials for the Study of the Uncommonly Taught Languages: Languages of East Asia (Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1976, pp. 1-18.)

By far the most popular text for classical Chinese is Shadick's A First Course in Literary Chinese, Volumes I, II, III; these materials were mentioned by 18 different respondents.

6.2 Use of Supplementary Materials

One question in our survey form attempted to discover whether teachers of Chinese in this country are using instructional materials that are not published as main texts, but rather are used to provide variation and "real-life" interest to the language classroom. In the commonly-taught languages a wide variety of such materials exist--both printed and audiovisual--which can be adapted by the language teacher. This appears not to be the case for Chinese language instruction, judging from the responses we obtained, and those supplementary materials that do exist appear not to be widely used in the field (e.g. videofilms produced at Princeton and at Stanford and Berkeley). We divided the responses relating to supplementary materials into three parts: printed materials, tapes, and video materials.

Supplementary printed materials tend to be most used in first-year Chinese instruction, and to be textbook materials listed in the Johnson et. al. Survey. These are simply regular text materials which are used in addition to the basic text used in the classroom. Only ten respondents (9% of our

TABLE 15

MOST COMMONLY USED FIRST-YEAR BASIC TEXTS

Text	No. Times Mentioned
DeFrancis, John. *Beginning Chinese*, Rev. ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1963.	44
Elementary Chinese, Parts I, II. Peking China: Commercial Press, 1974.	29
DeFrancis, John. *Character Text for Beginning Chinese*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1964.	25
Fenn, Henry C. and M. Gardner Tewksbury, *Speak Mandarin: A Beginning Text in Spoken Chinese*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1967.	22
Tewksbury, M. Gardner *Speak Chinese*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Institute of Far Eastern Languages, 1948.	17
Inter-Agency Language Roundtable. *Standard Chinese: A Modular Approach*. Washington, D.C.: Inter-Agency Language Roundtable.	6

TABLE 16

MOST COMMONLY USED FIRST-YEAR CHARACTER-LEARNING TEXTS

Text	No. Times Mentioned
Wang, Fred Fang-yu and Richard Chang. *Read Chinese, Books I, II, or III*. New Haven, CT: Far Eastern Publications, 1958-61.	59
DeFrancis, John. *Beginning Chinese Reader*: Parts I, II. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1966.	26
Wang, Fred Fang-yu. *The Lady in the Painting*. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1957.	9

TABLE 17

MOST COMMONLY USED SECOND-YEAR BASIC TEXTS

Text	No. Times Mentioned
Huang, Parker Po-fei, et. al. *Twenty Lectures on Chinese Culture: An Intermediate Chinese Textbook*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1967.	31
Wang, Fred Fang-yu. *Chinese Dialogues*. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1953.	28
DeFrancis, John and Teng Chia-yee. *Intermediate Chinese*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1964.	12
DeFrancis, John. *Character Text for Intermediate Chinese*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1965.	7
Inter-Agency Language Roundtable. *Standard Chinese: A Modular Approach*. Washington D.C.: Inter-Agency Language Roundtable.	3

TABLE 18

MOST COMMONLY USED SECOND-YEAR CHARACTER-LEARNING TEXTS

Text	No. Times Mentioned
Wang, Fred Fang-yu and Richard Chang. *Read Chinese* Books I, II, III. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1958-61.	62
Chinese Reader, Parts I and II. Peking, China: Commerical Press, 1972.	45
Lee, Pao-chen. *Read about China*. 2nd ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1958.	17
DeFrancis, John. *Intermediate Chinese Reader: Parts I and II*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1967.	16
Hsia, Linda and Roger Yen, eds. *Strange Stories from a Chinese Studio*. New Haven, CT: Far Eastern Publications, 1958.	8

TABLE 19

MOST COMMONLY USED THIRD-YEAR TEXTS

Text	No. Times Mentioned
Mills, Harriet C. and P.S. Ni. Intermediate Reader in Modern Chinese. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1967.	12
Liu, Wu-chi and Tien-yi Li, eds. Readings in Contemporary Chinese Literature. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1964-68.	10
Chih, Yu-Ju. A Primer of Newspaper Chinese. Rev. ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1970. (reprint of 1956 ed.)	6
Huang, Parker Po-fei, et al. Twenty Lectures on Chinese Culture: An Intermediate Chinese Textbook. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1967.	6
Hsu, Vivian. Readings from the People's Daily. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1975.	5
DeFrancis, John. Advanced Chinese. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1966.	4

TABLE 20

FOURTH-YEAR TEXTS MOST COMMONLY USED

Text	No. Times Mentioned
Liu, Wu-chi and Tien-yi Li, eds. *Readings in Contemporary Chinese Literature*. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1964-68.	10
Chi, Wen-shun, ed. *Readings in Chinese Communist Documents*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1963.	3
Chih, Yu-Ju. *A Primer of Newspaper Chinese*. Rev. ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1970. (reprint of 1956 ed.)	3
Chi, Wen-shun, ed. *Readings in the Chinese Communist Cultural Revolution*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1971.	2

return) said that they were using supplementary printed materials. Virtually all the usage of "supplementary" audiotapes appears to be the tape programs of the standard text materials in use. Only 12 respondents (11% of the sample) made specific mention of audiotaped materials. It is very likely that a substantially larger proportion of Chinese teachers makes use of the taped programs which accompany virtually all basic texts for Chinese language instruction. Since we did not ask whether our respondents were using the taped materials that accompany their basic text, we cannot verify this point, however. Only five respondents indicated that they make use of supplementary video materials, and three specified the materials being used: one respondent is using a slide-tape presentation, "Young American Scholars Travel in the People's Republic of China", by Berninghausen and Chiang. Two respondents use the Princeton videofilm Biao (The Watch), one of these uses the Princeton film Ai Le Zhong Nian (The Sorrows of Middle Age).

6.3 Most needed Materials of Instruction

Most of our information concerning needed instructional materials for Chinese language teaching comes from a question in which our respondents were asked to rank-order a number of possible types of materials which they might need. The options we supplied are listed in the right-hand column of Table 21 on page 55. Responses for ranks 1 through 3 are found in the first three columns of Table 21; an expression of overall interest (a sum of ranks 1, 2, and 3) is listed in column 4 of the table. Graded reading material was listed as the first priority need by 28% of our respondents; 19% indicated the need for graded listening comprehension materials to be the first priority. Listening comprehension materials were ranked as the second most important priority by 32% of our respondents, and "real-life" listening comprehension material from Chinese television and film was indicated as the third most important area for materials development by 22% of our respondents. The fact that the first three options listed on our question turned out to have the largest proportion of responses for ranks 1, 2, and 3, respectively, causes us some concern about the validity of any conclusions that we may make here. It could be that a significant proportion of our respondents simply rank-ordered the first three options in our questionnaire. It could also be, of course, that in constructing our questionnaire, we by chance listed our options in a way that corresponded with the perceived need for materials of a significant proportion of Chinese language teachers.

If one adds the first, second, and third rankings in order to obtain the percentage of respondents who mentioned a particular type of material (see Column 4 of Table 21), one obtains a slightly different picture of priorities for materials development than that just sketched. Overall, graded listening materials were mentioned by the largest proportion of our respondents (63%), followed closely by graded reading materials (59%). The next three categories of materials listed on our questionnaire fell well below those just mentioned, although a substantial proportion of respondents obviously feels that there is a need for these materials: "real-life" listening comprehension materials from Chinese television and film (43%), listening and reading comprehension materials from the PRC (37%), and better materials to teach Chinese characters to Americans (36%). A total of 19 respondents indicated a need for a wide variety

TABLE 21

MATERIALS OF INSTRUCTION MOST NEEDED FOR CHINESE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, BY RANK ORDER, IN PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS

Type of material	Ranked First	Ranked Second	Ranked Third	Total % Rankings 1-3
Graded reading material	28%	17%	14%	59%
Graded listening comprehension materials	19	32	12	63
"Real-life" listening comprehension material from Chinese TV and films (Hong Kong and Taiwan)	12	9	22	43
Materials from the Peoples Republic of China for both listening and reading	13	13	11	37
Better materials to teach Chinese characters to Americans	12	12	12	36
Other	8	3	5	16
Missing	9	6	6	n/a

of other materials in our free response section. Five of the responses called for audio-tapes (which supports even further our result that this is the first priority of the field), and the rest were single mentions of such materials as "textbooks from the Far East", "programmed (self-correcting) instructional materials", "bilingual dictionary", "second-year text", "grammar book", "dialogues", and "transparencies."

One respondent commented upon the need for textbooks "which are designed for teaching students in America with no cultural exposure to China...which... teach them to say things that Chinese say frequently...but which also teach them to say things that American students are going to want to say or talk about even if low frequency or unusual in China, i.e., 'pass the butter', 'to hitchhike', 'televison program', etc." This same respondent mentioned that the materials of the Inter-Agency Language Roundtable's Standard Chinese: A Modular Approach come closest to achieving this.

6.4 Materials under Development

In response to a question asking whether anyone in the Chinese language instruction program was currently engaged in developing materials for instruction, thirty-seven of our respondents (33%) said that there was materials development taking place. The vast majority of this materials development is taking place within NDEA centers (9 of 12 respondents are developing materials), large universities (16 of 46 respondents are developing materials), and small universities (9 of 28 respondents are developing materials). Respondents from only three of 14 responding four-year colleges reported that instructional materials were being developed; none of the eleven two-year college respondents reported materials development at their institution. A listing of authors, titles, institutions, and funding sources (if any) may be found in Appendix B.

7.0 Program Characteristics

7.1 Organizational "Home" of Chinese Language Study

As indicated by Table 22 on page 57, Chinese language instructional programs are to be found in a wide variety of different administrative units in American colleges and universities. The largest programs tend to be situated in departments of Far-Eastern language and literature. Such is the case with slightly over half of the NDEA centers (7) in our sample and with almost 20% (8) of the large universities in the sample. On most campuses however, Chinese language is one of the foreign languages taught in a department of modern/foreign languages. About half of the Chinese language instruction programs are thus situated in four-year colleges, small universities, and large ones. In nine of eleven 2-year colleges reporting, Chinese is taught in the department of foreign languages. A small number of institutions house their

TABLE 22

ORGANIZATIONAL "HOME" OF CHINESE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

Academic Unit	NDEA Center	Large Univ.	Small Univ.	4-year College	2-year College	TOTAL
Modern or Foreign Languages	1	19	16	7	9	52
Far Eastern Languages and Literature	7	8	1	0	0	16
Area Studies	4	3	5	3	1	16
Linguistics	0	5	1	0	0	6
Slavic or Germanic Languages	0	4	0	1	1	6
Chinese Language and Literature	0	2	1	1	0	4
Romance Languages	0	3	1	0	0	4
Social Studies	0	1	1	0	0	2
Neglected or Critical Languages	0	1	0	0	0	1
Other, Miscellaneous	0	0	2	2	0	4

TABLE 23

PRESENCE OF AN AREA STUDIES PROGRAM, BY TYPE OF PROGRAM AND BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	NDEA Center	Large Univ.	Small Univ.	4-year College	2-year College	Totals
Chinese Area Studies	3	8	6	2	2	21
Far East Area Studies	3	11	7	6	1	28
Other, Unspecified	1	1	1	0	0	3
Other, Miscellaneous, With Comments	5	17	8	5	3	38
Not Applicable or Missing	0	9	6	1	5	21
TOTAL	12	46	28	14	11	111

Chinese language instruction programs within an area studies program; this accounts for a small proportion of all categories of our sample with the exception of the NDEA centers (four institutions, 31% of the sample). The remaining Chinese instruction programs, almost 25% of the total, are housed in one of the following academic units: linguistics, Romance languages, Slavic or Germanic languages, neglected or critical languages, a social science department, other (unidentified academic unit).

Of the institutions responding to our questionnaire, slightly over 79% indicated that they house an area studies program that relates to China. About 19% of our respondents reported having a program in Chinese area studies, while 25% reported the existence of a Far Eastern area studies program. A large number of our respondents (34%) took the opportunity to describe the type of area studies program at their institution. Virtually all of the large number of write-in responses (34% of the total) may be assigned to one of our designated categories, however.

While a large proportion of institutions teaching Chinese have in addition an area studies program focusing either on China or on the Far East, it is the Chinese language instruction program which in most cases is solely responsible for determining the language curriculum at the institution. Fifteen percent of our respondents indicated that Chinese language curriculum is determined by language instructional personnel in collaboration with area studies instructors outside of the Chinese language program, and 11% indicated other unspecified interdepartmental arangements. Almost 67% of our respondents, however, specified that it is the Chinese language instructional program alone that determines its curriculum.

7.2 Program Structure

7.2.1 Organization of First-Year Instruction -- Non-Intensive vs. Intensive

Of those institutions responding, by far the largest proportion (28%) organizes first-year non-intensive Chinese language instruction by having instructor-professors manage the instructional process, which is carried out by them and by lower-level personnel, either lecturers, tutors, or TA's. Approximately 16% of respondents indicated that each Chinese language teacher is responsible for his or her own class, with half of these respondents mentioning that coordination between these autonomous instructors was quite close, while the other half indicated that there was little or no coordination. Only 8% of respondents specified that a team-teaching approach is used, with teachers sharing the responsibility for several sections. This approach is particularly popular in the NDEA centers, however, with 4 out of 12 institutions reporting this as the instructional organization for their first-year non-intensive courses. A disappointing 45% of our respondents chose not to answer this question, so we cannot be extremely confident that the procedures just outlined are representative of the whole population.

From the responses in our sample, it appears that very few institutions of higher education in this country offer intensive Chinese language instruction. In our sample, 8 of 12 NDEA centers were teaching intensive Chinese during academic year 1978-79, as were 9 of 46 large universities, 7 of 28 small universities, 2 of 14 four-year colleges, and no two-year colleges. Most commonly-used by far is the instructional organization in which professor/instructors manage lower-level instructional personnel; 56% of the total 25 institutions offering intensive Chinese indicated that this organization is used. The next most frequently-used organizational pattern is the team-teaching one, with 20% of reporting institutions. Autonomous individual instructors were reported by 24% of the respondents.

7.2.2 Average Class Size and Number of Sections, First Year

Fifty-four percent of our respondents indicated that the average class in first-year Chinese at their institution contains between 11 and 20 students in non-intensive courses. Only 8 institutions reported average class sizes of 5 or less students; only 15 reported average class size between 6 and 10 students for non-intensive courses. Twelve of our respondents (16% of those answering this question) indicated that their class size in non-intensive first-year Chinese is 21 students or more.

For intensive first-year Chinese, average reported class size is smaller, as one might surmise. Fourteen institutions (50% of those responding to this question) indicated that class size for this type of instruction is between 6 and 10 students. Three institutions (11% of those responding to the question) indicated a class size between 1 and 5 students, while 10 institutions (36% of those responding to the question) indicated classes of between 11 and 20 students. Only one institution indicated a class size of 21 or more students for intensive language instruction.

Virtually one-half of our responding institutions indicate that they had one section only of beginning non-intensive Chinese in fall 1978. (See Table 24 on page 61.) Twelve institutions offered no first-year non-intensive courses during fall 1978. One sees from Table 7C that several of the NDEA funded centers operate extremely large multi-section elementary Chinese language instructional programs.

The vast majority of institutions offering intensive first-year Chinese run only one section at a time. Seventeen of a total of 27 institutions indicating that they conducted such a course in fall 1978 had only one section. Six institutions reported 2 sections, 2 reported 3 sections, and one reported 4 sections.

7.2.3 Emphasis on Various Aspects of Language Instruction

Respondents were asked to estimate the percent of emphasis placed on various aspects of instruction in Chinese language, from the first through the fourth year. They were asked to consider not only the time spent in class, but also time their students spend with a tutor (if available), language laboratory work, and homework. In first year Chinese instruction, our respondents

TABLE 24

NUMBER OF NON-INTENSIVE (NI) AND INTENSIVE (I) SECTIONS OF FIRST-YEAR CHINESE, FALL 1978, BY INSTITUTION TYPE
(QUESTION D-19)

No. of Sections	NDEA Ctr.		Lge. Univ.		Small Univ.		4-yr. Coll.		2-yr. Coll.		Totals, Institutions		Totals, No. of Sections		
	NI	I	NI	I	NI	I	NI	I	NI	I	NI	I	NI	I	ALL
0	1	2	5	21	5	16	1	6	0	8	12	53	0	0	
1	1	5	27	5	11	6	11	1	5	0	55	17	55	17	72
2	3	3	8	1	8	1	1	1	4	0	24	6	48	12	60
3	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	2	12	6	18
4	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	16	4	20
5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	5
6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	6
7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	7
Missing	1	2	4	16	2	5	0	6	1	3	8	32			
TOTAL	12	12	46	46	28	28	14	14	11	11	111	111	149	39	188

0 70

71

indicate that from 15% to 22% of instructional effort is placed upon pronunciation. As is the case with virtually all of these estimates, averages by institution type do not vary by much more than 10%, which leads us to conclude that there is a certain degree of consensus in Chinese language teaching about what is most important. It should be noted as well that major deviations from these averages are not shown in our figures here, which are averages only.

For first-year Chinese instruction, most respondents place between 16% and 23% of the total emphasis on grammar mastery, with such mastery being least important to community college instructors and most important to respondents from small universities. With respect to developing communicative competence (i.e., the ability to use known patterns to express personal meaning), most respondents cluster around 15%, with NDEA center respondents averaging slightly over 17%. Oral comprehension (i.e., developing the ability to understand spoken Chinese) is estimated by most of our respondents to merit between 13% and 22% of instructional effort. Oral comprehension appeared to be least important to respondents from four-year colleges, and most important to community college respondents.

Respondents were asked to rate two activities with respect to the Chinese writing system: those designed to develop the ability to read Chinese characters, and those relating to developing students' ability to write Chinese characters. The majority of respondents indicated that the sum of these two activities should account for approximately 25% of the effort in a first-year Chinese language course, with approximately 15% of the effort going toward learning to read Chinese characters, and 10% going toward learning to write them.

The development of an appreciation of and a knowledge about Chinese culture is not considered an extremely important part of a beginning Chinese language course, judging from the responses to our questionnaire. Chinese culture is deemed worthy of between 4% and 7% of the instructional effort, with two-year colleges recommending the latter, and the other types of institutions recommending between 4% and 5%.

Responses to our questionnaire indicate significant changes in priorities as one goes from the elementary level to the advanced level of Chinese language instruction. For instance, most respondents indicated that, in the first year, pronunciation deserves about 16% to 20% of the instructional effort. By the second year, most respondents had reduced this percentage to between 11% and 13%; by the third year, the percentage was further reduced to 6-8%. By the fourth year the percentage of overall effort devoted to pronunciation had dipped below 5%.

With respect to grammar instruction, most respondents reported between 18% and 25% effort on this in first year Chinese, while the percentage reported by most respondents in second-year courses was in the neighborhood of 16%. By third and fourth year Chinese, this emphasis dropped below 10% for most respondents.

Most respondents reported expending approximately the same percent of effort on developing communicative competence in second year as in the first year, i.e., approximately 15%. By the third year, however, this level of effort was down to about 12%, and was below 12% for the fourth year. For oral comprehension, respondents of all institution types reported approximately the same level of effort for the first, second, and third years: 15%. By the fourth year, the level of effort is down to about 12%.

While most teaching activities concerning the development of oral competence receive a decreasing amount of emphasis as one proceeds from first through fourth year of Chinese language instruction, the reverse is true for instruction in the Chinese writing system. While 10-15% of instructional time is spent on reading Chinese characters in elementary Chinese, by the second year, most respondents indicate that approximately 20% of instructional time is spent in reading Chinese characters; in third year, between 24% and 34%, in fourth year, approximately the same. A similar increase in emphasis is seen in the amount of effort expended in learning to write Chinese characters. In the first year, between 7% and 12% of instructional time is spent learning the characters. By the second year, this percentage is slightly higher, averaging about 12%; by third year, the average is higher still, approximately 13%, where it remains in the fourth year.

While Chinese culture is not an important priority in first year Chinese language instruction, it becomes increasingly important in second through fourth years. A slight increase in importance is conveyed by our respondents for second year: an average of about 6% of overall instructional effort is reported for second year Chinese. By third year, the average is about 11%, and remains the same in fourth year.

Chinese language teaching in two-year colleges differs significantly from that in four-year academic institutions in several respects. First, pronunciation appears to be more important at the former, both in first and second year Chinese (20% of instructional effort is expended upon pronunciation in both years) than it is in four-year institutions. Grammar mastery is less important in two-year college Chinese language courses, both first and second year. Less importance is placed upon reading and writing Chinese characters in two-year colleges than in four-year institutions. Finally, instruction about Chinese culture is more important in community colleges than it is in four-year institutions. These differences in emphasis probably stem from the fact that 2-year college Chinese language instruction is directed to a predominantly ethnic Chinese student body that is less "academically inclined" than that found in other institutions. In addition, this student body is likely to have some familiarity with spoken Chinese, and may not be inclined to study its grammar or to study intensively the writing system.

7.2.4 Hours of Instruction Per Year

In order to determine how much exposure a student could have to Chinese language by taking a sequence of language courses, we obtained from our respondents information about the number of hours per week the courses met and the number of weeks of instructional time there are per year. We were thus able to obtain the information displayed in Table 25 on page 64.

TABLE 25

EXPOSURE HOURS PER YEAR, BY COURSE LEVEL* AND INSTITUTION TYPE (QUESTIONS D-1, D-2)

Level	NDEA Center	Large Univ.	Small Univ.	4-year College	2-year College
First year*	191	150	163	148	124
Second year*	182	123	139	135	120
Third year	127	100	144	109	0
Fourth year	109	92	91	83	0
Total instructional hours after following a four-year (two-year for 2-year institutions) sequence	609	465	537	475	244

*For 1st and 2nd year courses, intensive and non-intensive sections are considered together with sections of unspecified intensity.

Our original intent was to obtain information about non-intensive courses and intensive courses, and to compare the number of instructional hours one could typically expect to receive in each of these. Since we did not receive good data to differentiate between intensive and non-intensive instruction, Table 25 lists number of hours for all first and second year courses. It is interesting to note the different number of hours obtained, particularly in first and second year, across institution types. The higher number of average hours in first year courses in NDEA centers no doubt stems at least in part from the fact that some of these courses are intensive and thus include a significantly higher number of hours per year. Since large universities have a fairly high percentage of intensive courses, we are suprised at the comparatively low total (465 hours) for a four year sequence of Chinese language. Noteworthy as well is the decrease in number of contact hours per year over the four-year span of the course sequence in question, for virtually every institution type. The only exception to this is a slight rise in number of hours per year between years two and three in small universities. We will return to this topic in Section 8 during our discussion of student competence.

7.3 Testing

7.3.1 Use of proficiency tests for placement and promotion.

In response to the question, "Do you test your students' knowledge of Chinese with a proficiency test (i.e., a test not designed to measure student mastery of material learned in a specific course) at any point during your sequence of language courses?", 85% of our respondents answered in the negative. Most of the 12 respondents who answered affirmatively made reference to a "homemade" test, usually used for placement at the time of enrollment. Another respondent mentioned a proficiency test administered only to students who are in a bilingual instructional-aid program. Two respondents employ the United States Department of Defense Language Proficiency Test in Chinese to evaluate listening and reading abilities.

Elsewhere in our questionnaire, we posed the question: "How do you evaluate the Chinese language competence of incoming students in order to place them?" Respondents were allowed to indicate as many responses as were appropriate. From our total of 111 respondents, 50 (45%) indicated that none of their entering students possessed any significant Chinese language competence whatsoever, and that therefore a placement test was not called for. Of the remaining respondents, virtually all indicated that they gave incoming students an informal oral examination, though only three institutions mentioned any formal oral testing (such as the oral interview examination performed by U.S. Government language schools). Very few institutions appear to be using recommendations from former teachers (5.4% of the total respondents) in the placement of incoming students. Thirty respondents told us that they employed some sort of written test, either reading or writing or both, in order to evaluate and to place incoming students. Overall, 42% of our respondents indicated that they use at least one method of evaluation for incoming students, 39% use at least two methods, and 9% use at least three.

7.3.2 Need for and potential use of standardized proficiency tests

Eighty-three percent of our respondents answered "yes" to the following question: "Do you feel that a standardized test of Chinese language proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing needs to be developed?" Support was highest among respondents from the larger universities (92% positive), and least positive in the NDEA centers (72% positive) and two-year colleges (73%).

Despite the overwhelming expression of support for such a standardized test in our statistics, for those respondents who wrote a comment on our questionnaire form, opinion was split nearly equally, with 20 respondents making supportive comments, 16 respondents making negative comments, and 3 making neutral ones. The most frequently repeated negative remark was that standardized tests would be difficult, if not impossible, to write because of differences in romanization, text materials, vocabulary, methods, and standards between Chinese language instructional programs. Positive comments were that it would be useful to have a nationwide "yardstick," that the test could serve a useful purpose for placement of incoming students, and that such a test would be useful for establishing standards for Chinese language teaching nationwide.

Eighty-four percent of our respondents indicated that they would use a standardized proficiency test of Chinese, were one available. Very few of our respondents (6%) said that they would not use such a test; it appears that some respondents who would otherwise have responded negatively here may have simply chosen not to respond to the question, since 11% of our questionnaires had no response indicated to this question. Of the 93 respondents answering "yes" to the question, 37 provided a comment, most of which gave conditions for the use of any such proficiency test. The greatest concerns of our respondents were first that the test be "good," and second that it be suitable for use with the students in the respondent's program. For example, would a standardized proficiency test be available for use with students (primarily linguistics majors) whose only goal might be to gain contact with a non-Indo-European language? In sum, the overwhelming majority of respondents appear positively disposed to use a test of Chinese proficiency, if such an instrument (or instruments) might be devised that would provide the requisite flexibility given the wide variety of programs and the different goals reflected in each.

7.4 Methods of Utilizing Taped Instructional Materials

Respondents were asked to indicate both the mode of utilization (traditional language laboratory, take-home cassette material, etc.) and the language skill (listening comprehension, pronunciation practice, etc.) most emphasized in their use of taped instructional material. For both of these questions, respondents were provided a list of options, including write-in options, and were asked to rank-order their responses.

By far the most important method of tape utilization appears to be the "library system," in which students attend a language laboratory outside of class time, checking out instructional tapes as they are needed. This method of tape utilization was reported to be most commonly used by 48% of our respondents. Most institution types reported this level of usage, though NDEA centers and two-year colleges reported proportions of 38% and 36%, respectively.

Take-home cassettes are the most commonly-used mode of tape utilization in 19% of our respondents' programs, with all institution types reporting very nearly this level of usage. Language laboratory use, with all students listening to one tape program, was reported to be the most common mode of utilization by 18% of our respondents. This mode of usage was most common among NDEA centers (31%, four institutions) and in two-year colleges (36%, four institutions). Only 7% (8 institutions) of our respondents reported that the most frequent mode of tape utilization involves the use of a tape recorder in the language classroom itself. Three institutions reported that they used dial access laboratory systems, and one respondent mentioned that the taping of classroom activity was the most important mode of tape utilization in the program.

Overall, 79% of our respondents (88 institutions) indicated that they made use of a tape library system, and 68% (76 institutions) told us that take-home tapes were used in their programs. Broadcast of a single program to students working in a language laboratory situation was reported by 32% (35 respondents), and a tape recorder in the language class was used by 27% (30 institutions) of our respondents.

It is clear from the results just enumerated that by far the most widely used method of audio-tape is through the "library system," which permits the student to have complete control over the tape program utilized. Supplying take-home cassette tapes to students, which also permits student control over the instructional material, is done by almost as many institutions as use the tape library system, but is not considered first-priority usage by nearly as great a proportion of respondents as the latter.

With respect to the specific language skill practiced through the use of taped material, by far the largest proportion of respondents (52%) indicated that listening comprehension was the most important use of tape recordings in their programs. Thirty-two percent of our respondents indicated that pronunciation practice was the most important usage of taped material. Respondents in two-year colleges appear to differ significantly from those in other types of institutions in their assessment of the importance of taped materials for pronunciation practice and listening comprehension. Six of 11 respondents (55%) reported that taped materials were most important for pronunciation practice, while 4 of 11 respondents (36%) told us that such materials were most important for listening comprehension. Listening comprehension in the two-year colleges does not have the high priority it does in other institution types. Mastery of grammatical structures is perceived by a very small percentage of our respondents (5%) as the most important usage of taped material.

With respect to overall usage of taped material, the pattern is similar to that reported for first-priority usage above. Language tapes are used for developing listening comprehension skills by 90% of our respondents (100 institutions). For pronunciation work, 81% (90 institutions) used taped material. Seventy-four respondents (67%) reported that they use taped material to help students practice Chinese structures. Although a very small proportion of respondents consider pattern practice to be a first priority usage of tapes (only 5%), fully two-thirds of our respondents report such usage of tape material for practicing the patterns of Chinese.

The results just discussed indicate a high level of tape usage in Chinese language instruction. Only one institution (a large university) indicated that tapes were not used at all in Chinese language instruction there. However, it would seem that, given the extreme difficulty of Chinese for American students, and the consequent large number of practice hours needed in order to begin to develop some communicative ability in that language, that any institution seriously dedicated to developing such competence would be using taped instructional materials to supplement classroom time for the development of all skill areas dealing with oral production and reception.

7.5 Chinese Dialects and Romanizations Taught in Institutions Surveyed

The preponderant dialect for Chinese instruction in the United States is Mandarin. During academic year 1978-79, our respondents reported a total of 155 students (138 undergraduates, 17 graduates) registered for courses in Cantonese. Of the 17 graduate students, 12 were in enrolled in three different NDEA centers, and 5 were studying in a small university. Of the undergraduates, 50 were in four different NDEA centers, 24 were in three large universities, 50 were enrolled in one small university, and 14 were studying at one two-year college. Among our respondents, there were only two students reported to be studying other Chinese dialects.

We asked our survey respondents what forms of romanization their students were able to use after having successfully completed their sequence of Chinese language courses. Judging from our responses, there are three different forms of romanization currently being used in Chinese classes in this country: pin yin, Yale, and Wade-Giles. Pin yin is by far the most widely taught; 72% of our respondents reported that their students were able to use this romanization, and several individuals indicated that their instructional program was adopting this romanization over one used in the past. Second most frequently indicated was the Yale romanization; 59% of our respondents reported that their students were able to use it. The Wade-Giles romanization was indicated by 41% of our respondents. Students from 12% of the programs surveyed (13 institutions) are able to use a fourth romanization, the National Phonetic Alphabet (NPA). The NPA is particularly useful for students who plan to pursue study in Taiwan. With respect to differences between institution types regarding usage of different romanizations, our results show that pin yin is used in all 12 NDEA centers of our sample, while other institution types report a less systematic usage of this romanization (between 64 and 86% of total respondents in other categories). The Yale romanization is used in approximately 65% of all institutions, with the exception of small universities, of which only 43% (12 institutions) report usage. Wade-Giles is used by 6 of 12 NDEA centers and by only 2 of 11 two-year colleges (18%). Institutions of other types fall between these two percentages. The NPA is used primarily in NDEA centers and large universities.

Thirty-nine percent of our respondents indicated that only one romanization is learned by students at their institutions. For two-year colleges, the percentage is 55%, for NDEA centers, this is the case for only 2 of 12 institutions reporting. Twenty-nine percent of our respondents told us that their students learn two different romanizations; at 23% of our respondents' institutions, students learn three different romanizations. In 5% of responding institutions, students learn four or more romanizations.

7.6 Study Abroad

As we discuss in more detail below, extended experience in a Chinese-speaking environment is a virtual necessity in order for the Anglophone American to attain substantial oral and written communicative ability in Chinese. For this reason, the availability of high-quality study abroad opportunities for American students is of extreme importance. We sought in our questionnaire and in our supplemental research to determine the number of Americans studying Chinese abroad and the quality of the programs in which they were enrolled, based upon the anonymous comments of our respondents. In the time since our questionnaire data were gathered (March-April 1979), opportunities for Chinese language study have greatly increased within the People's Republic of China, making the data reported here of mainly historical interest. Several questions of critical importance that are highlighted by our data will continue to be important, however, and will need the continuing attention of those interested in assuring adequate Chinese language training for Americans. First, we must recognize the crucial importance of the study abroad experience for the development of meaningful competence in Chinese; this experience must come as early as possible (preferably during the undergraduate years), so that individuals receiving advanced training in their chosen disciplines are not hampered by the need to acquire basic facility in the Chinese language. Second, the sources that fund American education must recognize that study abroad in the Far East is an expensive undertaking and that undergraduates and graduates seeking to obtain advanced levels of Chinese language competence are worthy of fellowship support. Currently, neither undergraduate nor graduate study of the Chinese language itself makes one eligible for fellowship support. Thirdly, appropriate means must be utilized to make known the strengths and weaknesses of the many overseas institutions offering Chinese language study to American students. This information must be provided to the various institutions in this country which send students abroad to develop their Chinese language competence. Despite the overwhelmingly positive evaluation by our respondents of the study abroad experience in general, it is clear that some programs are substantially superior to others, simply because care is taken to use appropriate materials and methods and to train instructional personnel to use these tools well. The only published list of programs we discovered appears in two publications of the Institute of International Education: Gail A. Cohen, ed. U.S. College-Sponsored Programs Abroad: Academic Year, 1979 and Gail A. Cohen, ed. Summer Study Abroad, 1979. Many of the programs referred to by our respondents do not figure in these publications.

7.6.1 Ways in Which Study Abroad is Encouraged

The most common way our respondents' institutions encourage study abroad is by making literature from institutions offering study abroad experiences available to American students of Chinese language: 75% of our respondents indicated that such information is being provided to students on their campuses. All twelve NDEA centers make available such literature, as do slightly more than three-quarters of the large and small universities responding to our questionnaire. Only slightly more than half of our four-year and two-year colleges reported doing the same, however.

Fifty-nine percent of institutions responding indicated that they accept credits from courses taken abroad. While smaller universities and four-year colleges appeared to use this more than other institution types (68% and 71% of respondents in these categories, respectively), only 1 of 11 two-year colleges reported that credits from study abroad are accepted.

The third most frequently mentioned method of encouraging study abroad is that of waiving course requirements in Chinese if a student has received equivalent instruction abroad; 38% of our respondents indicated that this practice is followed on their campuses. Procedure varies widely by institutional type in this matter, however: while 58% of NDEA centers reported waiving course requirements, the practice was reported by only 29% of four-year colleges. Slightly more than 40% of large and small universities reported that such course-waiving is done. None of our 11 two-year institutions permits the waiving of course requirements for study abroad, although this may simply be because there are no course requirements.

7.6.2 Institutions and Programs in the Far East

We requested of our survey respondents a listing of institutions in the Far East to which they sent students, individually or in groups, between 1976 and 1979. The information presented in Table 26 on page 71 represents the ten most frequently-mentioned institutions; some 26 other institutions were mentioned by one survey respondent each. The vast majority of respondents indicated that students went abroad individually, making their own arrangements, rather than in groups organized by American institutions.

As mentioned above, the majority of our respondents have an overwhelmingly positive impression of the effect of experience abroad on the Chinese language competence of their students. Only 25% (12 of 47 comments received) of our respondents' comments regarding study abroad programs had anything negative in them whatsoever. Institutions receiving the most postive comments were the Taipei Language Institute, the Mandarin Daily News Institute, and the Inter-University Program in Taipei. Several critical remarks were made of each the following institutions: The Mandarin Center in Taipei, Tung-Hai University in Taipei, unnamed institutions in Hong Kong, Singapore and Beijing. The criticisms reported in our questionnaires are not susceptible to analysis and reporting here, since they are for the most part quite general, and there are not enough of them to obtain any sense that they might be representive. It is for this reason that we recommend, as mentioned above, that a critical analysis of the various programs receiving Americans be done, in order to provide infor-

TABLE 26

TEN INSTITUTIONS IN THE FAR EAST HAVING RECEIVED THE MOST AMERICAN STUDENTS OF CHINESE FROM 1976-1979

(QUESTION D-11)

Name	NUMBER OF MENTIONS
Mandarin Language Center, (Taipei)	23
Inter-University Program for Chinese Language Studies, Taipei (Administered by Stanford University)	19
National Taiwan Normal University	16
Oberlin Program (Tunghai University)	10
Chinese University of Hong Kong	7
Taipei Language Institute	6
Yale-China	6
National Chengchi University	6
Mandarin Daily News	4
Beijing Language Institute	2

mation to better counsel American students planning to study Chinese abroad, and in order to help the institutions in the Far East better accommodate their American clientele.

One study abroad program must be singled out for special description here, since in our view it represents a national resource for the development of Chinese language competence that could disappear or seriously degenerate in quality if it does not receive appropriate levels of support. Almost without exception, in our discussions with various individuals around the country involved in Chinese language teaching, we found that Anglophone Americans who are leaders in Chinese language teaching and who do not have the advantage of having been brought up speaking Chinese, had spent some time in the Inter-University Program for Chinese Language Studies in Taipei (IUP). In addition, a significant number of native Chinese language instructors currently teaching in the country have spent some time at IUP as instructors. Clearly, this institution has had a major impact upon Chinese language teaching in this country and upon the level of Chinese competence of several hundred of the most fluent non-native speakers of Chinese in the United States.

IUP, administered by Stanford University, was established in 1963 with substantial funding, which lasted over the first nine years of its existence, from the Ford Foundation. Several other private foundations have also contributed to the support of IUP. Since 1970, however, principal support of IUP has come from various agencies of the United States government, chiefly the U.S Office of Education.

For nearly the past decade, the program has received support on a year-to-year basis, a situation which has the potential to compromise its quality. Several of the respondents to our survey say that this is already happening. In order for the IUP to continue to be at the forefront of Chinese language teaching, there is need for changes in several important areas. The first of these is the need for a pedagogical policy for the IUP which will include the expenditure of effort to monitor more carefully than in the recent past the quality of teaching. Secondly, there is need for a shift from the almost exclusively individual tutoring mode which is presently utilized at the Center, to small-group (3-5 individuals) instruction, with a much larger portion of the classes using a fixed curriculum. It is anticipated that a considerable savings might be realized by effecting this type of change. Thirdly, the teaching materials utilized by the IUP should be carefully evaluated and upgraded. Fourthly, the language laboratory needs to be updated and better utilized. Fifthly, the placement and achievement-testing program needs considerable attention and improvement. For these desirable changes to take place, the IUP needs to have firm funding, which can probably only come from the federal government. For more detailed information regarding the functioning of the IUP, see the Report on the Joint Evaluation Session of Intensive Overseas Language Programs.

7.6.3 Number of American Students Studying Chinese Language Abroad, 1978-79.

Table 27 on page 73 displays the information we received from our respondents regarding their students' study abroad during 1978-79. It is interesting to note the difference in study abroad patterns between institution types. For

TABLE 27

NUMBER OF UNDERGRADUATE (UG) AND GRADUATE (G) STUDENTS FROM INSTITUTIONS IN OUR SAMPLE STUDYING CHINESE ABROAD, BY INSTITUTION TYPE, 1978-79

	NDEA Ctr.		Lge. Univ.		Small Univ.		4-yr. Coll.	2-yr. Coll.	TOTALS		
	UG	G	UG	G	UG	G	UG	UG	UG	G	ALL
Semester/Summer	6	4	53	5	6	0	42	25	132	9	141
Whole year	6	24	37	22	26	6	43	9	121	52	173
Totals	12	28	90	27	32	6	85	34	253	61	314

NDEA centers, study abroad is clearly a typically graduate rather than an undergraduate affair: a total of 28 graduate students versus 12 undergraduates went abroad from NDEA centers during 1978-79. NDEA center students also tend to spend a whole year abroad rather than a semester or summer: 30 students spent a whole year abroad, versus 10 for a semester or summer during 1978-79.

In all other institution types, the pattern for study abroad is different from that just described for NDEA centers: undergraduate students outnumber graduate students in both large and small universities, while four-year and two-year colleges, of course, send only undergraduates abroad. While NDEA centers have the largest number of students studying abroad per institution (a total of 40 students abroad from 12 NDEA centers), the vast majority of students traveling abroad are doing so from institutions belonging to the other four categories (a total of 274 students abroad from 99 institutions). Thus, while NDEA centers appear to be sending abroad the largest number of graduate students to do extended language learning and research in Chinese, by far the largest number of individuals with some considerable contact with Chinese language and culture are coming from large and small universities, four-year and two-year colleges, which do not have federally-funded NDEA centers.

7.6.4 Institutions in U.S. Receiving the Most Transfer Students in Chinese Language.

In order to gain an impression of the extent of inter-institutional referral for Chinese language study within the United States, we asked that our respondents tell us to which institutions they sent their Chinese language students to receive instruction. By far the most frequently-mentioned by respondents was Middlebury College, which was cited by 25 different institutions. Next in order of frequency were: University of California at Berkeley (mentioned 4 times), Princeton and the University of Washington (Seattle) (each mentioned 3 times), Columbia University, Georgetown University, Seton Hall and the University of Michigan (each mentioned twice). Each of the following institutions was mentioned once: San Francisco State University, Tufts University, University of British Columbia (Canada), University of Pennsylvania, University of Southern California, Wellesley College, Wittenberg University.

7.7 Self-Instructional Chinese (Self-Study Programs)

In an attempt to provide low-cost instruction for languages with low enrollments, some institutions have implemented programs offering such languages (of which Chinese is one) in a self-instructional mode. These institutions do not offer Chinese instruction using full- or part-time salaried instructors. Rather, they make available the opportunity for self-study of Chinese under the guidance of faculty (who may or may not know some Chinese) who organize the self-instructional process. These programs, almost all of them influenced by the model promulgated by the National Association for Self-Instructional Language Programs (NASILP), usually involve motivated, talented students working with materials that lend themselves to self-instruction, involve drill session with native-speaking tutors, and a final examination given by an outside examiner.

Fourteen institutions returned a special questionnaire which we developed to discover the extent and nature of self-instructional Chinese language instruction. Five out of 14 programs we identified are located in New York State; the other nine are fairly widely distributed throughout the eastern and central United States: one program each in Kansas, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and Wisconsin. Usually the programs are located in institutions that can tap the Chinese language-teaching expertise of a nearby university for consultation and testing, although this is not always the case.

Self-instructional programs in Chinese do not attract large numbers of students (maximum number recorded in one year at one institution in our survey was 13), and a program that enrolls a half-dozen students one year may have none enrolled the next year. In fall 1974, total enrollment of all fourteen self-instructional programs was 38; in fall 1977 the total was 57 enrollments; in fall 1978, 39 enrollments.

Despite the ephemeral nature of Chinese instruction on many of these campuses (NASILP programs are designed to accomodate such fluctuations), the programs themselves appear generally quite hardy. Six have been in existence since before 1970, four were established between 1971 and 1974, and the rest between 1975 and 1978.

Typically, the only self-instructional course offered in Chinese is first year, though five schools held an intermediate class in fall 1978, and three institutions also offered an advanced level course (though enrollments were in each case only one student). The most common first year texts are DeFrancis's Beginning Chinese and Character Test for Beginning Chinese. For second level Chinese, DeFrancis's Intermediate Chinese is cited most often.

Instructional time (hours per week) varies from school to school. Six of the 14 schools indicated that the students spend time with a responsible faculty member; this time does not usually exceed one hour per week. In most institutions, students spend from 1 to 5 hours a week with a native-speaking tutor. The amount of time spent in the language lab ranges from zero to 10 hours a week. Time needed for self-study in the form of reading and writing homework or taped exercises ranges from 2 to 12 hours per week, the total amount of course work varying from 6 to 12 hours per week. With an average instructional year lasting 28 weeks, self-study students are receiving somewhere between 168 and 336 hours of "contact time" with Chinese over an academic year.

All the Chinese self-instructional programs have a faculty member in charge; however he or she may or may not have a background in Chinese. One institution has a native Mandarin-speaking teacher and a graduate student tutor who assist the language department chairman in the management of the program. In two other schools, the responsible faculty member has some background in Chinese. Faculty with background in linguistics or some language other than Chinese head the self-study programs in more than half of the institutions.

Formative evaluation of student progress is variable: some institutions administer periodic quizzes, while others base ongoing evaluation on tutor reports. Several programs give a mid-term examination.

At the end of the course, a final examination determines the student's grade. Nine institutions indicated that an outside examiner, usually from a nearby institution with an established Chinese language program, administers this test. The examiner is usually not only an experienced Chinese instructor but an experienced oral tester as well. Frequently, this person is familiar with the Chinese Oral Proficiency Interview developed by the Foreign Service Institute of the U.S. Department of State.

According to our respondents, students enroll in a self-study course in Chinese for a variety of reasons, most of them the same as those exhibited by students in courses offered through regular faculty. (See Part 8 of this report). Many are pursuing majors in Chinese area studies and want to gain some familiarity with the language. Others are language or linguistics majors who need knowledge of a non-Indo-European language. Still others are ethnic Chinese, some of whom are "looking for an easy 'A.'" Some are merely "intellectually curious." Most students who enroll in self-study Chinese do not continue on to more advanced language study at other institutions offering that instruction.

In response to our question about what lay ahead, most of our self-instructional respondents indicated that they saw no change in program structure. Several explained that they were hopeful for expansion (principally because normalization of U.S. relations with the Peoples' Republic of China had kindled interest in Chinese language study) but that budget restrictions at their institutions would probably preclude the hiring of an instructor. It seems that our respondents view self-instructional Chinese as a cost-effective way to offer a course to students with a passing interest in a language that otherwise would not be available.

8.0 Student Characteristics

8.1 Language Competence of Arriving Students

As may be seen from Table 28 on page 78, a substantial proportion of entering students of Chinese in three out of five institutional categories know enough of the language to skip the first year course. Four-year colleges and two-year colleges have only 10% and 18%, respectively, who are placed in classes beyond the first year. The question in our survey form read as follows: "Of the students registering for Chinese language instruction at your institution for the first time in fall 1978, how many arrived with enough competence in Chinese to place into second year and above Chinese language courses?" This question was designed to explore the kinds of Chinese competence demonstrated by incoming students; the statistics discussed in this section cannot be compared meaningfully with those discussed in section 4, Enrollments, of this report.

We were surprised by the large proportion of new students of Chinese in our reporting institutions who entered second, third and fourth-year language classes. For example, in NDEA centers, large universities, and small universities, the proportion of new students entering second-year Chinese is in the neighborhood of 20%. Furthermore, in NDEA centers, 22% of incoming undergraduates went directly into third- or fourth-year classes. The percentage of third- and fourth-year placements for large and small universities is somewhat less: 12% for the former, 18% for the latter. Across all institution types, 27% of new undergraduate students of Chinese placed beyond the first year of instruction.

As one might expect, a larger overall proportion of arriving graduate students enter courses beyond the first year of Chinese: 56% over all institution types (see Table 29 on page 79). One might expect the percentages of placement into advanced Chinese language instruction to be even higher than they are in NDEA centers, for instance, unless one takes into account the fact that many of the individuals being counted here are in reality pursuing graduate work in one of the social sciences rather than in Chinese language per se.

Where do Chinese language students acquire the competence that permits them to be placed in advanced language courses? For undergraduates, the largest proportion of these students have learned Chinese in the home environment (36%), and the next-largest group are immigrants, who have learned Chinese in the Far East (see Table 30 on page 80). Only eighteen percent of those students placing beyond first year Chinese had acquired their competence in either high school, two-year or four-year college.

For graduate students, the story is a quite different one: 52% of graduate students entering at levels beyond first year Chinese had acquired their knowledge at another institution. While not nearly as great a proportion of graduate students had acquired their knowledge of Chinese in a native-speaking environment, the percentage is still substantial: 30% (17 out of 56 students) either learned Chinese at home in the U.S. or before immigrating.

TABLE 28

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ENTERING AT LEVELS BEYOND FIRST YEAR IN FALL 1978, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	NDEA Ctrs.		Lge. Univ.		Small Univ.		4-yr. Coll.		2-yr. Coll.		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total new students	184	100	525	100	451	100	577	100	240	100	1977	100
Entering at second year level	32	17	105	20	101	22	30	5	42	18	310	16
third year level	24	13	43	8	55	12	15	3	-	-	137	7
fourth year level	17	9	22	4	27	6	12	2	-	-	78	4
Total entering beyond first year level	73	40	170	32	183	41	57	10	42	18	525	27

TABLE 29

GRADUATE STUDENTS ENTERING AT LEVELS BEYOND FIRST YEAR IN FALL 1978, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	NDEA Ctrs.		Lge. Univ.		Small Univ.		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total new students	26	100	20	100	44	100	90	100
Entering at second year level	5	19	6	30	5	11	16	18
third year level	8	31	5	25	6	14	19	21
fourth year level	6	23	8	40	1	2	15	17
Total entering beyond first year level	19	73	19	95	12	27	50	56

TABLE 30

SOURCES OF COMPTENCE IN CHINESE OF STUDENTS PLACING BEYOND FIRST YEAR IN FALL 1978

Source of Competence	Undergraduate		Graduate	
	No.	%	No.	%
Learned at home	190	36	9	16
Native speaker immigrant	159	30	8	14
Learned Chinese in high school	42	8	2	4
Learned Chinese at a community college	22	4	5	9
Learned Chinese at another college	32	6	29	52
Miscellaneous prior exposure	57	12	-	-
Unaccounted for (no response)	23	4	3	5
TOTAL	525	100	56	100

TABLE 31

RESPONDENTS' LISTINGS OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND INSITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION REGULARLY PROVIDING STUDENTS WHO KNOW SOME CHINESE (QUESTION E-4)*

Reporting institution	School providing Chinese speakers	No. per year
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle	Senn High School	(unreported)
Arizona State University	West High School	3
American Graduate School of International Management	Arizona State University	2-3
	University of Arizona	2
	Brigham Young University	2
Western Washington University	Unknown high school in Tacoma, Washington	1
University of Minnesota	Minneapolis Central High School	2
University of Hawaii	Roosevelt High School	2
	McKinley High School	1
	Sun Yat-sen School	3
	Mun Lun School	3
	Iolani School	1-2
	Dunahov School	1-2
Rutgers University	Hunterdon High School	1-2
Baruch College, CUNY	Seward Park High School	20
	Washington Irving High School	20
Monterey Institute of International Studies	Defense Language Institute	1-2
Washington University (Missouri)	Wittenberg University	1
Boston University	Harvard Extension	2
Ohio State	Wittenberg University	1-2
	DiVillbis High School	occasional
University of Pittsburgh	Mt. Lebanon High School	1

*Few respondents answered this question. We would like to think that there are many more colleges and universities that receive beginning or transfer students who have some prior knowledge of Chinese.

For a language that is as difficult for speakers of English as is Chinese, it is important that students be able to study it over an extended period of time. With this in mind, we asked our respondents to list institutions, both secondary and higher education, from which they regularly received students who had some competence in Chinese. Table 31 on page 81 lists the institutions mentioned by our respondents.

In order to ascertain what sort of Chinese was spoken by incoming students, we asked the following question: "What sort of Chinese was spoken by those students (both undergraduate and graduate) taking a course in Chinese for the first time at your institution in fall 1978, who had acquired their Chinese in ethnic communities in the U.S. or who were immigrants?" Of the 501 students listed by our respondents 65% spoke Cantonese, 10% spoke Mandarin, 5% Taiwanese and 19% spoke other dialects. Specifically mentioned among these dialects were: Hokkien, Hakka, and Shanghai. One respondent mentioned that in the past, Cantonese had been virtually the only dialect of incoming students of Chinese, whereas recently there had been as many Mandarin speakers as Cantonese.

We have discussed in a previous section (7.3.1, Use of Proficiency Tests for Placement and Promotion) the kind of testing done in our respondents' institutions in order to place incoming students.

8.2 Language Competence of Graduating Students

In an attempt to estimate the number of Americans per year who might be attaining useful competence in Chinese, we asked our respondents the following question: "In your institution, about how many students per year, both undergraduate and graduate, achieve speaking and reading proficiency which might be described as follows (include in your totals those students who achieve higher proficiency than described)?" The definitions for reading and speaking/listening were adapted from those used by the Foreign Service Institute for its "limited working proficiency" (R-2 and S-2), as described in Jones and Spolsky (1975). The definitions we used in our questionnaire made no reference to the FSI rating numbers, and read as follows:

Reading: can read simple prose, in a form equivalent to typescript or printing on subjects within a familiar context.

Speaking/Listening: able to handle with confidence but not with facility most social situations including casual conversations about current events. Can also handle limited work requirements.

Table 32 on page 83 displays the responses to the question just cited. It is our impression that the data appearing in Table 32 do not reflect accurately the number of American students of Chinese reaching the S-2/R-2 performance level every year. In fact, we suspect that the actual number of students achieving such performance levels is a fraction of the number listed in Table 32.

TABLE 32

NUMBERS OF STUDENTS PER YEAR ACHIEVING "LIMITED WORKING COMPETENCE" (FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE S-2/R-2) AS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS

	NDEA Ctrs.	Lge. Univ.	Small Univ.	4-yr. Coll.	2-yr. Coll.	TOTAL
S-2, undergrads	153	221	239	74	113	800
S-2, grads	44	29	17	-	-	90
S-2, total	197	250	256	74	113	890
R-2, undergrads	172	349	164	79	112	876
R-2, grads	45	56	12	-	-	113
R-2, total	217	405	176	79	112	989

One reason for our lack of confidence in the totals appearing in Table 32 is that these totals represent the responses of only a segment of our responding group. A substantial proportion of our respondents, in some cases 50% or more, did not choose to answer this question.

Two factors may be contributing to this low rate of response. First, respondents were asked in this question to think about student performance in a way that they are not accustomed to. Also, in an attempt to make the question as concise as possible, it may not have included enough information about the proficiency level we were attempting to define, thereby confusing respondents and causing them not to answer. The second factor is simply that the question was located near the end of an extremely time-consuming questionnaire form. The busy respondent would be tempted to skip this question rather than spend several minutes on it when he or she obviously was near the end of the form.

Another reason for our lack of confidence in these data is that by the end of four years of Chinese language study in a classroom setting, students would not have had enough hours of language training in Chinese to attain S-2 and R-2 levels. According to data gathered by the Foreign Service Institute, a student of average language learning ability takes approximately 1,320 hours of training to attain the S-2/R-2 level in Chinese. A student studying Chinese in an academic setting would probably not spend as much as 600 hours in Chinese language training in four years. This figure is arrived at by using average number of contact hours per week for the various Chinese language courses as reported in Table 25 (page 64) and by assuming an academic year of 28 weeks' duration. We feel that it is extremely unlikely that courses taken in addition to those specifically directed toward language-learning would contribute significantly to filling the 700-hour gap between FSI experience and academic experience in language training time.

It is widely believed that in order to achieve meaningful competence in the Chinese language, some residence in a Chinese-speaking environment is absoultely mandatory. If one assumes that all those students who spent at least one sementer abroad attained an S-2/R-2 proficiency level (an optimistic assumption), the total number of students per year (if 1978-79 is a typical year) would be 314 (see Table 27, page 73).

In sum, we believe that there are enough data from other portions of our questionnaire to enable us to reasonably question the accuracy of the totals in Table 32. This means that we did not in our questionnaire make clear enough the proficiency level which we were intending to describe in our question. This impression is supported by some of the comments of our respondents. For example, several of them commented that they were not clear as to the proficiency level intended. Several others commented that it was their impression that a student achieved this proficiency level after having completed two years of Chinese study, while others said that the level described was attained by their students after three years of Chinese study. We conclude that the confusion generated by this question is ample testimony to the need for carefully-defined levels of competence for Chinese language and tests to measure these levels of competence. Of course Chinese is not alone in needing such descriptions; virtually all other languages taught in the United States are in similiar need.

Richard D. Lambert gathered self-reported assessments of language and area specialists' competence in speaking, reading, and writing (Lambert, 1973). The data on China specialists were then analyzed in detail by Elizabeth T. and Joseph A. Massey (Massey and Massey, 1974). This discussion represents the only national study of Chinese language competence that exists. The data used in this analysis were questionnaire forms returned by approximately 50% of the area specialists and graduate students in area studies. The Masseys determined that approximately 1/3 of the professional specialists who had not learned Chinese as children had either no competence at all or very little competence in Chinese; only 25% of the professional specialists who were learning Chinese "from the beginning" had "full competence" in Chinese. Both Lambert and the Masseys used a composite scale whereby the self-reported abilities for speaking, reading, and writing were totaled to obtain a composite score. For instance, an individual reporting that he speaks, reads, and writes Chinese "easily" would be said to have full competence in Chinese. The Masseys' analysis concluded that reading was the most widely developed skill (40% of the respondents reported being able to read easily), while 34% said they were able to speak easily and only 9% were able to write Chinese characters easily. Interestingly, graduate students reported higher competence in Chinese than did practicing professionals, which gives cause for some optimism about the trend in the quality of Chinese language instruction.

The Masseys concluded that those specialists, both practicing and graduate students, who had studied Chinese both in the United States and in China showed a larger proportion of respondents among those claiming to have "full competence" in Chinese. This is at least partly because those who had studied in both countries also tend to be those who have spent the longest time overall studying the language: 5 years or more in the formal study of Chinese. According to the Masseys' analysis, 2 years' study are needed for a student of Chinese to progress from no competence or low competence to intermediate competence, 5 years to obtain the "advanced intermediate" stage, and 7 years to obtain full competence in reading, writing, and speaking the language.

The Masseys also concluded that a "threshold" appears to exist beyond which extended residence in a Chinese-speaking environment does not significantly influence one's ability to use the Chinese language. Residence longer than at least one visit and two years' total residence does not seem to significantly increase an individual's competence in Chinese. The Masseys point out, however, that travel to a Chinese-speaking environment is no doubt very valuable in preventing language skills from atrophying. (The above discussion is paraphrased from pages 78-84 of Massey and Massey, 1974.)

6.3 Student Motivation for Studying Chinese

Thirty-six percent of our respondents indicated that they had recently polled their students to determine their reasons for studying Chinese. Such surveys had been conducted most frequently in small universities (46% -- 13 institutions -- of respondents in this category), and least frequently performed in NDEA centers (15% -- 2 institutions -- of respondents).

In tallying the various motivations mentioned in the responses of the 38 respondents who chose to comment on this portion of the questionnaire, we made a distinction between integrative (a motivation characterized by a genuine interest in the Chinese culture and civilization) and instrumental (a motivation characterized by the desire to use knowledge of Chinese for some economic or social gain). Most of the 38 respondents who commented gave several different kinds of motivation, all of which were tallied. Interestingly, instrumental and integrative motivations received almost identical total tallies: 37 for the former and 36 for the latter. Under instrumental motivation, the most frequently mentioned reason was the potential usefulness of knowledge of Chinese in a future career, mentioned by 20 respondents. Eight respondents mentioned the potential usefulness of Chinese for tourism or study abroad; 7 made reference to the need for knowledge of Chinese as a research tool for further study. Most frequently mentioned integrative motivations were: a general interest in the language and culture of the Chinese people (22 respondents), and an interest in studying the Chinese culture by those with a Chinese ethnic heritage (7 respondents).

In addition, unrelated to the integrative/instrumental opposition we have just discussed, seven respondents mentioned that students found their way into Chinese classes because they were fulfilling the foreign language requirement at their institution.*

Certainly the motivations of undergraduate students and graduate students differ to a considerable degree. Although our data analysis did not make a distinction, in the statistics just analyzed, between undergraduate and graduates, we surmise that graduates tend to have a more pragmatic, instrumental outlook toward the study of Chinese, since they are likely to be pursuing advanced degrees in subject areas other than Chinese language and literature for the most part, while motivations of undegraduates are more likely to be of the integrative type.

8.4 Students' Present and Future Career Plans

In order to discover whether the potential openings for Chinese language instructors in the near future might be filled by the students graduating from institutions currently teaching Chinese, we asked our respondents how many of their students of Chinese who received their degrees in 1978 were planning to become teachers of Chinese language (not literature or area studies). According to the responses we received, a total of 16 undergraduate students at 9 institutions (6 NDEA centers, 1 large university, 1 small university, and 1 four-year college) were planning upon their graduation in 1978 to become teachers of Chinese. A total of 14 graduate students at 9 institutions (4 NDEA centers, 4 large universities, and 1 small university) graduating in 1978 were planning to teach Chinese language. If in fact all 30 individuals intending to teach Chinese language upon their graduation, 1978 set out to find jobs at that time it is likely that a substantial proportion of them were not successful, since, as was mentioned in Part 5.3 above, only 38 openings for Chinese language instructors are foreseen over the next five years. Thus it appears that Chinese language instruction is suffering from the same syndrome afflicting the more commonly-taught languages: an oversupply of instructors being graduated by institutions of higher education. It will be interesting to assess the status of this situation once again after a period of several years, since it appears from evidence gathered since our survey was conducted that a number of institutions are either reestablishing or establishing for the first time Chinese language instruction programs, due to the heightened interest in China in the United States today.

---

*A particularly interesting and thorough exploration of student motivation in studying Chinese is Richard Thompson's Survey of Students Taking Chinese Language Courses, 1976-77, done at the University of Hawaii at Manoa, Department of East Asian Languages. It must be noted, however, that Thompson's student population is an atypical one: over 80% of the students are Chinese or part-Chinese (page 4).

Another conclusion one must reach upon looking at the potential teachers of Chinese indicated by our respondent population is that Chinese language teachers in the U.S. are coming from an extremely small group of institutions.

Of course the individual intending to teach Chinese must receive adequate pedagogical preparation as well as being fully qualified to speak, read and write the language, and having sufficient grammatical knowledge of Chinese and of English to explain differences between languages whose structures differ very greatly. In response to our request for a listing of the pedagogical courses available to students who want to prepare themselves to teach Chinese, respondents from 13 different institutions (3 NDEA centers, 8 large universities, one small university, and one two-year college) indicated that at least one course relating to the teaching of Chinese was offered on their campus. When one pedagogical course is available, it is typically offered by the same academic unit that teaches Chinese language, be it East Asian Studies, Chinese language, linguistics, etc., and is entitled "Methods of Teaching Chinese," or something similar. One institution offers a course entitled "Methods of Teaching Critical Languages," another offers a combined Chinese/Japanese methods course. When a second course is available to prospective Chinese language teachers (the case at six institutions), its focus is either contrastive linguistic analysis of English and Chinese or continued seminar work in methodology.

At the outset of this study it was our impression from having talked with numerous individuals within the field of Chinese language teaching that a large proportion of students who took long sequences of Chinese language instruction were not majors in the language, but were seriously interested in acquiring enough Chinese to be able to use the language as a tool. In order to test this assumption we asked our respondents to indicate how many undergraduate and graduate students taking third and fourth year Chinese language courses at their institutions during academic year 1978-79 were majoring in a disciplinary area other than Chinese language. Table 33 on page [illegible] displays results of this inquiry, and substantiates our preliminary impression. For both graduates and undergraduates across virtually all institutional categories the percentage of non-Chinese language majors in upper division courses in Chinese lies between 70% and 85%. Those percentages which fall

TABLE 33

PROPORTION OF THIRD- AND FOURTH-YEAR CHINESE STUDENTS NOT MAJORING IN CHINESE

		NDEA Ctrs.	Lge. Univ.	Small Univ.	4-yr. Coll.	TOTAL
UNDERGRAD	Total 3rd & 4th yr. Chinese lang. enroll.	275	389	104	67	835
	No. NOT Chinese majors	238	308	86	56	688
	Percent NOT Chinese majors	87%	79%	83%	84%	82%
GRAD	Total 3rd & 4th yr. Chinese lang. enroll.	123	46	13	2	184
	No. NOT Chinese majors	103	32	6	2	143
	Percent NOT Chinese majors	84%	70%	46%	100%	78%
TOTALS	Total 3rd & 4th yr. Chinese lang. enroll.	398	435	117	69	1019
	No. NOT Chinese majors	341	340	92	58	831
	Percent NOT Chinese majors	86%	78%	79%	84%	82%

outside this range are most likely to be subject to error, since they all come from very small sample groups, for instance, graduate students in small universities and four-year colleges. NDEA centers have a larger proportion of non-majors in upper division Chinese courses than other institutional categories. One reason that larger numbers of students may not be Chinese language majors is that many institutions that teach Chinese do not offer a major in that language (see discussion of degrees offered by respondents' institutions in Section 5, Program Characteristics).

We were interested to discover whether or not any common patterns exist for employment and education among students of Chinese language. To do this, we asked our respondents to provide brief information for those individuals who graduated from their institutions during calendar 1978 with some considerable competence in Chinese language. Our previous contacts with college and university departments teaching the more commonly taught languages had led us to believe that very little follow-up was done of students who had graduated. Since we were prepared to see the same situation for Chinese, we were impressed when respondents from 43 institutions were able to provide information on 135 students who had graduated during calendar year 1978. Of this total, 108 had received a bachelors degree, 9 had received an M.A., and 8 had received a Ph.D. Ten students' degrees were not specified.

For B.A. recipients, by far the largest proportion was continuing academic work: 64 students out of the total 108. Of these, 29 were studying some specific discipline other than Chinese language, 20 were pursuing graduate work of an unidentified nature, and 15 were engaging in further study of Chinese. A total of 9 individuals were reported to be teaching: 6 were teaching Chinese, 1 was teaching English, and 2 were teaching unspecified subjects (which could have included Chinese). Our respondents reported that 15 of the 108 B.A. recipients were employed in non-academic jobs, of which 11 were in business and commerce. Seven were in the armed services, and 6 were in other governmental agencies. Of the M.A. recipients, all but 2 were continuing work toward a doctoral degree; these 2 were employed by the U.S. government. All Ph.D.'s were teaching or engaging in other scholarly activities such as writing books, with the exception of one individual who had gone into international banking.

9.0 FUNDING CHINESE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

9.1 Institutional Support during Academic Year 1978-79

Our survey form included several questions concerning the funding of Chinese language instruction that were intended to enable us to estimate the total amounts spent, the amounts spent by individual colleges and universities, and the amount of "outside funding" (grant or contract money from either federal government or private foundation sources). Unfortunately, we received mediocre to very poor rates of response to most of our questions concerning funding. In many cases, the individuals filling out our questionnaire form may not have had easy access to finanical information; even with access to such information, it is frequently difficult to separate salary spent for language instruction from that spent on, for instance, instruction in Chinese history, when an individual faculty member teaches in more than one area. Furthermore, our questions concerning financial matters came at the end of an extremely time-consuming questionnaire form. We believe, however, that some interesting and useful data were obtained; they are reported below.

Table 34 graphically demonstrates the wide diversity in funding levels for instructor salaries in Chinese language instruction on U.S. campuses. Notice that a total of 5 institutions--2 large universities, 2 small universities, and 1 four-year college--indicated that no money at all was spent for Chinese language instruction. This means either that such instruction on these campuses was provided as an overload or that the respondents didn't understand the question. At the other end of the spectrum, 3 NDEA centers and 3 large universities report expenditures of more than $100,000 during academic year 1978-79 for Chinese language instruction.

In an attempt to estimate the total expenditures for Chinese language instruction by all colleges and universities in the country, we extrapolated by institution type, using the totals indicated at the bottom of the columns in Table 34. For instance, looking at the third column in Table 34, we discover that a total of 32 large universities spent $1,238,700 on Chinese language instruction during academic year 1978-79. Our investigations lead us to believe that there are a total of 72 institutions in this category (see Table 2 in Section 3.1). Assuming that the amount spent for the 32 institutions that responded to our questionnaire is representative of the total population of 72 institutions in this category, we conclude by extrapolation that all 72 institutions would spend $2,548,000 during academic year 1978-79 on Chinese language instruction. While this is a risky assumption to make, particularly for those institutional categories where the percentage returns are small in comparison to the total (e.g., especially two-year colleges, but also small universities), we have done so to obtain an order of magnitude estimate. Adding the sum of our extrapolations for personnel costs to those of extrapolations for non-personnel costs (see Table 35 for our point of departure for these costs), the grand total for direct costs is $5,614,000, of which $5,437,000 are personnel costs.

9.2 Outside Support (Governmental and Foundation) for Institutional Programs

As mentioned above, the low rate of response to our questions concerning financial matters leads us to interpret our data with a great deal of caution. It seems safe to say, however, that expenditures by the federal government and particularly by private foundations are extremely small when compared to the institutional totals discussed in the previous section.

TABLE 34

LOCAL FUNDING OF CHINESE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION (PERSONNEL COSTS) DURING ACADEMIC YEAR 1978-79, BY INSTITUTION TYPE
(QUESTION F-1)

Level of Funding	NDEA Ctr.	Lge. Univ.	Small Univ.	4-yr. Coll.	2-yr. Coll.	TOTAL
$0	0	2	2	1	0	5
$700 - $9,999	0	9	6	3	2	20
$10,000 - $19,999	0	8	4	1	1	14
$20,000 - $29,999	0	4	5	3	0	12
$30,000 - $99,999	4	9	2	1	0	16
$100,000 +	3	3	0	0	0	6
No response	5	11	9	5	8	38
Total dollar amount	$641,200	$1,238,700	$338,200	$155,200	$20,000	$2,393,300
Average expenditure per institution	$ 91,571	$ 35,391	$ 17,800	$ 17,244	$ 6,667	$ 32,785

TABLE 35

LOCAL FUNDING OF CHINESE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION (NON-PERSONNEL COSTS) BY INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION DURING ACADEMIC YEAR 1978-79, BY INSTITUTION TYPE (QUESTION F-1)

	NDEA Ctr.	Lge. Univ.	Small Univ.	4-yr. Coll.	2-yr. Coll.	TOTAL
No. institutions reporting	6	25	12	6	2	51
No. institutions reporting 0 expenditures	1	5	3	2	1	12
No. N/A or missing	5	16	13	6	8	48
Total dollar amount	$17,500	$29,400	$4,900	$5,300	$600	$57,700

196

197

From our total of 111 respondents to the questionnaire, a total of 11 non-military respondents (we received questionnaires from 3 of the federal military academies) indicated that they had received during academic year 1978-79 some amount of federal support. Of these eleven responses, seven were from NDEA centers, and four institutions had received federal support from another source. One of these four, a two-year college in California, was using ESEA Title VII (bilingual education funds) for Chinese language instruction. The other three respondents did not describe the federal source.

Unfortunately, the number of our NDEA respondents providing a dollar figure for federal support for Chinese instruction was insufficient to enable us to arrive at an average figure here, thus making a dollar comparison between the information in Table 34 and the federal contribution impossible. For the single institution that did provide this data, federal support of Chinese language instruction was about 13% of that provided by the institution itself.

Some light is shed on this subject by the report of N. I. Schneider, "NDEA Centers: How They Use Their Federal Money." In this report, Schneider, Senior Program Specialist in the Division of International Education, U.S. Office of Education, notes that expenditures for language instruction across all world areas in NDEA centers have increased in recent years. Further, her detailed breakdown shows that in East Asia NDEA centers, slightly more than 19% of federal monies allocated to salary are spent for language instruction. Schneider stresses that most of these funds are used for teaching assistants and native informants, and that these funds have the principal effect of maintaining language course offerings at the advanced levels that otherwise would not be available because they consistently fall below university cut-off points for self-supporting instruction. She further asserts that "the NDEA funds for language instruction...therefore play a very important role in pursuading university administrations to maintain this relatively expensive training source." (Page 170)

Only four institutions reported that they had received funding from private sources during academic year 1978-79. Three of these grants were very small; the largest by far was the $30,000 received by a four-year undergraduate institution to help launch a Chinese language instruction program. Only one institution reported receiving money for Chinese language instruction from a source outside the United States. This grant of $5,000 from a private donor was used in 1978-79 to help support a study abroad program in Taiwan.

We were puzzled by the fact that 5 of the 12 institutions in our NDEA Center group did not indicate that federal dollars are being spent for Chinese language instruction. These non-responses may be due to the fact that these particular centers are spending their federal money for other components of their programs than language study.

9.3 U.S. Government and Foundation Support for Chinese Instruction not Directly Related to Programs

In addition to requesting information from our survey respondents concerning program support from governmental and foundation sources, we undertook a small survey of U.S. government agencies and selected foundations to ascertain what projects may have been funded in the recent past which relate to Chinese language instruction. We will describe briefly below the six projects we discovered that had been funded by the federal government (five through the Office of Education, one by the National Endowment for the Humanities), and six projects funded by two different private foundations.

Professor Y.C. Li, University of Hawaii at Manoa, received a one-year grant beginning 1 June 1978 to produce A Reference Dictionary of Mandarin Grammar and Usage for Students and Teachers. This dictionary is "specifically tailored to meet the problem-solving needs of the teacher and student in a classroom situation through its extensive arrangement of topics and patterns in the table of contents and indexes." In addition to the introductory chapter, chapters are included which treat the following syntactic elements: Chapter 2, types of sentences, order of elements, and function words; Chapter 3, the verb phrase: its related structures and elements; Chapter 4, the noun phrase: its related structures and elements.

Professor Charles N. Li, University of California, Santa Barbara, and Professor Sandra A. Thompson, U.C.L.A., received a two-year grant beginning 1 July 1977 from the U.S. Office of Education to produce A Reference Grammar of Mandarin Chinese. "The grammar is focused on the semantic and syntactic patterns of Mandarin Chinese and explanations for these syntactic-semantic patterns. It is being written with a minimal use of linguistic jargon since our goal is that the grammar should be used by the teachers and students of Chinese who might not have had any linguistic training." The grammar is neither transformational nor structural in its orientation, rather, "most of the explanations for the descriptive generalizations have either semantic or pragmatic bases."

Since 1974, several agencies of the federal government have been collaborating in the development of instructional materials for elementary and intermediate Chinese entitled Standard Chinese: A Modular Approach. This curriculum has been referred to several times during the course of our study (see Section 2 and Section 6, above). The course is innovative in several ways: programmed drill material is all to be done individually with tapes so that class time with the instructor may be used exclusively for realistic communication in Chinese in practical situations; the organization of the content is "situational" in nature, which permits a certain degree of flexibility with regard to what units are covered in sequence; communication games are used extensively to simulate real-life encounters.

Professor C.P. Sobelman, Columbia University, was funded by the United States Office of Education on 1 September 1977 to perform a 21-month project entitled "A Study of Chinese Language Structures."

Professor Albert Dien, Stanford University, was funded on 1 July 1977 for a two-year project entitled "Utilization of Videotape Recording for Intermediate Chinese Language Instruction and Advanced Language Maintenance" by the United States Office of Education. These materials have been alluded to above in Section 2.8. Fifteen videotapes adapted from Taiwanese television are available from the project director at Stanford University. The tapes are in Mandarin with Chinese subtitles. "They are all dramas ranging from modern plays about life in Taipei to slapstick comedy to sword fight films."

The National Endowment for the Humanities funded Professors F.W. Mote and T.T. Chen of the Chinese Linguistics Project, Princeton University, for the preparation of 10 research manuals. The project began on 1 April 1978, to run for two years. According to the summary description of the NEH project, "The Manuals are...on the one hand, language training aids for seminar-level classwork or self study, designed to assist the scholar to make the transition from formal language study to independent research capacity. On the other hand they simultaneously serve as guides into the intellectual and methodological problems encountered upon beginning research in a particular subfield of China studies."

During the 1960's, private foundations, most notably Ford and Rockefeller spent large amounts of money to further the development of Chinese language instruction in the United States, both at the secondary and at the higher education levels. This extensive effort is documented in Lindbeck's Understanding China. In more recent times, funding of Chinese language instruction has dwindled to a very small percentage of the funding levels of the 1960's. In fact, our survey of private foundations discovered only two that had funded Chinese language-related project since 1975: The International Foundation of Butler, New Jersey, and The Robert Sterling Clark Foundation, Inc., of New York.

Since 1976, the International Foundation has funded 5 projects and at the time we gathered our information had requests pending for several others. During 1976, the International Foundation funded a Chinese-English Dictionary project with CETA, the Princeton University Language Center, and Soochow University Language Center in Tawain. Soochow University Language Center received continuing support in 1977, and in 1978, Columbia University received funding for scholarly exchanges. According to the chairman of the grants committee, the foundation is "not likely to support Chinese language teaching as such in the forseeable future."

In 1975, the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation awarded Stanford University a grant for its "Chinese language and culture study program." Current foundation guidelines indicate that "this is not an area in which the Foundation is currently providing support."

10.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

In the United States, Chinese has been considered one of the "less-commonly" taught languages since this nation had its eyes opened to the languages of the world in the wake of World War II. While nothing in the data that we have collected leads us to believe that enrollments in Chinese will in the near future overtake those of German, for instance, it is likely that increased commerce and travel possibilities in China will cause modest increases in enrollments in Chinese study.

According to data gathered through surveys by the Modern Language Association of America, enrollments in Chinese language grew substantially through the 1960's and the first years of the 1970's. Betweeen 1974 and 1977, however, the MLA statistics show a slight decline in Chinese language enrollments. The data gathered by our survey indicates that this enrollment decline has probably been reversed, and that beginning in 1978, we should expect modest increases in Chinese language course enrollments in the near future.

A very small proportion of those individuals studying Chinese in institutions of higher education in this country major in Chinese language or literature, either at the undergraduate or at the graduate level. For instance, in our survey population, which reported a total enrollment of 5,382 students in fall 1978, only 132 undergraduate degrees and 29 graduate degrees were awarded during all of calendar year 1978. While students enrolled in Chinese courses number in the thousands, the number of Americans attaining advanced levels of speaking and reading competence -- enough to be able to communicate readily in a variety of social and professional contexts -- is very small, probably not more than two to three hundred per year at the most.

One objective of our study was to verify the accuracy of the Modern Language Association enrollment statistics, which we hypothesized to be somewhat high in their estimate of students actually studying Chinese language, since these statistics are obtained from college registrars, who may or may not be very assiduous in differentiating between courses in Chinese language and those which might treat Chinese language, culture, and literature, yet be conducted in English. Unfortunately, the rate of return of our questionnaire was not as good as that of the MLA; this means that we have to be extremely tentative in any conclusions we draw. We have estimated that the statistics of the MLA may be from 10% to 20% high because of the inclusion of courses conducted in English.

Compared to the number of students enrolled in Chinese language courses overall, the number of students studying Chinese abroad is very small: our respondents reported a total of 314 students abroad during the 1978-79 academic year, while Chinese language enrollments on the campuses of our respondents as of fall 1978 were 5,382 students. It appears, however, that such an experience --studying Chinese in the foreign environment--is absolutely imperative in order to develop a meaningful level of competence. While our respondents appear happy on the whole with the experience abroad of their students, it is clear that the quality of such programs varies widely. Since the largest number of American students traveling to the Far East do so on an individual basis, it would be very useful for these individuals to have a description of all Chinese language schools available to them, including evaluative comments of former American students.

Based upon the results of our survey, more than three quarters of the individuals teaching Chinese in this country today are native speakers of the language. Most of these instructors tend not to be in tenure-track positions. Over the next five years, there is not likely to be a large number of position openings for Chinese language teachers in institutions of higher education in this country. For both tenure-track and fixed-year contracts, approximately one-half of the institutions responding to our questionnaire foresee no positions whatsoever. Our respondents estimated that, over the next five years, 38 tenure-track openings would likely open, and 72 fixed-year contract positions would become available.

Our study provides some supportive evidence for the comments heard recently from several groups of visitors from the People's Republic of China to the effect that the Chinese taught in many American classrooms tends to be somewhat dated with respect to vocabulary and structure. Our survey results show that a fairly substantial proportion of Chinese instructors in this country have been here for some decades and have not been able to return to the Far East, for whatever reasons, to renew their contact with the language and culture. In Chinese as in other languages, high priority is not given to the establishment of exchange programs for individuals whose primary intent is to improve their instruction in foreign language. Until recently, of course, this situation has been compounded by the inaccessibility of China for such purposes.

In our survey, we have discovered the most frequently-used text materials in the United States today for first- through fourth-year Chinese language and for classical Chinese; this information is listed in Tables 15 through 20 (pages 48 through 53) of the report. Most materials used in first and second year instruction exemplify one strand or another of audiolingual methodology. The newest materials, Modern Chinese: A Modular Approach have not as yet achieved wide circulation, though they are very popular on those campuses where they are now in use. They have only very recently become available generally; several more years will be required to judge their acceptance.

Other materials potentially of great value, yet in very limited use today are those available from the People's Republic of China. Perhaps the increased dialogue between American and Chinese teachers of language over the coming years will cause this situation to change.

The use of audiotaped materials to supplement standard taped programs of basic textbooks is extremely rare, as is the use of video materials, either film or videotape. Materials developed recently by Stanford and Princeton, though potentially very useful, were shown by our survey to be used in very few institutions. As of August 1979, the Stanford materials, developed with a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, had been purchased by 24 institutions (of which two are in Australia). This is a small percentage of the total offering intermediate and advanced Chinese classes, for which the video tapes are designed.

According to survey responses, materials for graded reading and listening comprehension are the most urgently needed at this time. (See Table 21 on page 55).

The following recommendations follow from the information that we have gathered during this survey. We do not present these as the result of wide spread professional consensus among Chinese language teachers, although several of them are the more or less overt expression of majority opinion from our questionnaire responses. The majority of the recommendations are based upon our own judgment as language educators and researchers.

Recommendations Concerning Enrollments and Degrees.

1. Institutions of higher education must recognize the amount of time needed to make significant progress in learning the Chinese language. It has been demonstrated that the level of absolute competence in Indo-European

languages obtained by college graduates is not impressive. With the same expenditure of time, the student of Chinese is even less far along an absolute proficiency scale. The best way for colleges and universities to recognize the increased work load demanded of Chinese language students is to award larger amounts of credit for Chinese language than for the more commonly taught languages.

2. Young Americans must be provided the opportunity and encouraged to begin the study of Chinese early: in elementary or secondary school, if at all possible; in undergraduate school if an earlier start is impossible. This means that the work in Chinese language teaching currently being done under the aegis of bilingual educators must be encouraged and should be run in such a way as to enable monolingual Anglophones to begin developing some competence in Chinese language. Linkages between secondary schools offering Chinese and undergraduate institutions with strong language programs should be strengthened so as to provide the easiest possible transition between high school and college for promising students of Chinese. Finally, institutions of higher education should be encouraged to maintain strong undergraduate programs of Chinese language instruction, and should be equally encouraged to help these undergraduates find ways to undertake fairly extensive undergraduate study abroad in the Far East. In this way, by the time an individual has reached the point of graduation from college, he or she will have some meaningful competence in Chinese, and will need only more advanced, special purpose courses at the graduate level.

3. Large numbers of students should not be encouraged to major in Chinese language unless their Chinese language major is a second major. As with much language study today, it is imperative, given the small demand for Chinese language teachers in particular and foreign language teachers in general, that individuals be prepared in content areas other than foreign language so that they may find work after their college or university study. This is true not only at the undergraduate level, but at the graduate level as well, and includes not only specialists in Chinese but also East Asian area studies specialists as well. It is heartening to note that, at this writing, initiatives are under way within the federal government to provide incentive grant monies to encourage students with other content area majors to study enough foreign language to achieve a reasonable level of communicative competence. It is likely that Chinese would be named a priority language in any such federal initiative.

Recommendations Concerning Instructors:

1. Institutions of higher education should continually be encouraged to reward quality language teaching with status, recognition, and financial incentives. Classroom instructors of foreign languages in general and of Chinese in particular should not be relegated to the bottom of the academic totem pole. Those with talent and initiative should be rewarded with tenure and promotion.

2. It is likely that a significant proportion of Chinese language teachers in this country are teaching language that is somewhat out of date, particularly when compared to the language currently used in the People's Republic of China. Individual academic institutions and teacher exchange programs do not typically place high priority on the kind of professional development experience that takes a teacher of language to the target culture in order to pursue a structured course of study or research to update his or her knowledge of that language or culture. In fact, such travel is typically derided as a "boondoggle" and a free vacation for the language teacher involved. Given the appropriate controls for 1) the quality of the individual involved, and 2) the structure of the proposed investigation, nothing could be further from the truth. This country needs a teacher exchange program that would take significant numbers of American teachers of Chinese, be they native speakers or Anglophones, to a Chinese-speaking environment so that they can bring up to date their knowledge of the language. This is particularly desirable now that larger numbers of this nation's citizens may engage in study and travels in the People's Republic of China.

3. There is a need for non-native instructors of Chinese who are well-trained in both Chinese language and foreign language pedagogy. This is not to say that these indivduals should be put into place at the expense of native Chinese who are currently teaching: as with all languages, it is important for students to hear native speech and to have the opportunity to converse with native speakers of the language. However, native speakers of Chinese, like all native-speaking language instructors, have not gone through the process of learning the foreign tongue as a second language. This experience is extremely valuable--if not indispensable--for the second language teacher, and very few native speakers are able to duplicate it through classroom instructional experience alone.

Recommendations Concerning Materials of Instruction:

1. Graded reading materials and listening comprehension materials for elementary and intermediate Chinese language instruction are listed by our survey respondents as the first priority.

2. In addition to the materials just mentioned, there is need for imaginatively designed audio-visual materials for use with elementary and early intermediate language students (first- and second-year Chinese). These materials would be intended as supplementary materials only, and could be used for both listening comprehension and reading comprehension, in addition to providing audio and visual interest and variety of presentation.

Recommendations Concerning Other Aspects of Chinese Language Programs:

1. There is a pressing need for national standards of absolute proficiency in Chinese language, as there is in all other languages taught in this country. As is amply demonstrated in the text of this report (see Section 8.2) it is not possible at the current time to talk about levels of proficiency of students in a meaningful way, so that a variety of individuals,

who may be very experienced and talented language teachers, may understand one another. At this writing, an experimental effort is underway at the School of Language Studies of the Foreign Service Institute, U.S. Department of State, to test the feasibility of using the FSI-developed oral interview test in the academic situation. This pilot study is being conducted for French and Spanish only, but the oral interview exists in Chinese as well, and is used fairly regularly to evaluate Chinese competence in students who are engaging in self-study of Chinese using the paradigm developed by the National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs (NASILP).

2. A descriptive study should be done to provide information about all language instructional programs in the Far East in Chinese. This study should include evaluative comments, and should be done in order to enable individual American students, who in large part travel to the Orient on their own rather than in student groups, to make wise choices based upon accurate knowledge about the quality of Chinese language instruction that they are likely to encounter.

3. The United States Education Department must recognize the importance of the Inter-University Program in Taiwan for Chinese language instruction in the United States and take appropriate action to assure its continued viability.

4. There is a need for continued emphasis on the spoken language at upper levels of Chinese instruction in U.S. institutions of higher education. This need exists in virtually all language instruction in U.S. higher education, but particularly for Chinese, since it demands such a large expenditure of time in order to achieve meaningful levels of communicative competence. Our survey results indicate a considerable falloff in the number of hours per week devoted to instruction in upper-level courses. In addition, our results show changing priorities during instructional time which cause the Chinese writing system to receive increased emphasis as students progress through four years of instruction. This emphasis on the Chinese writing system is entirely appropriate, given its inherent difficulty. What is needed is an increase in the amount of time devoted to instruction in third- and fourth-year courses particularly, the added time being used for the continued development of both the speaking and listening skills in Chinese language.

5. A public relations effort is needed to convince the leadership of many institutions of higher education that the Chinese language is not an "exotic frill," but rather a legitimate means of communication used by one-fifth of the world's population, in a country that appears to be taking on increased importance with respect to United States foreign policy and economic development.

In conclusion, normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China has probably rendered many of the statistics on enrollments and study/travel abroad, and perhaps even textbook usage, in this survey to be out-of-date. We hope, in fact, that this is the case, and that the next time such a study is done, perhaps in five to seven years' time, the results of the present study will be seen as baseline data, and that subsequent statistics will show a growing number of Americans gaining sufficient knowledge of Chinese to be able to communicate in a language that is spoken natively by a significant proportion of the people inhabiting our globe.

APPENDIX A: PROJECT NARRATIVE

1.0 Identifying Institutions Teaching Chinese

In order to insure the largest possible return for our questionnaire, the first phase of our survey process identified individuals responsible for Chinese language instruction in the colleges and universities where such instruction is taking place. We began with the list of 210 institutions that had been reported by the Modern Language Association in its survey of college and university registrars in fall 1977. To this list we added several institutions whose names we had discovered through our search of the literature relating to Chinese language teaching. In addition, we contacted the Chinese Language Teachers Association for their membership list, and included those institutions which had not appeared on the MLA list. Finally, we consulted the Directory of Programs in Linguistics in the U.S. and Canada (LSA Bulletin, No. 80, December 1978), to be sure that we had not missed any institutions where Chinese was listed as an uncommonly taught language. By combining these different sources of possible institutions to survey, we ended up with 250 different colleges and universities on our initial mailing list for the survey.

All 250 institutions were mailed a letter explaining the project, with a return postcard enclosed on which was to be indicated the name of the responsible individual for Chinese language instruction, to whom we would mail the questionnaire. This mailing was done in October 1978. In November and December 1978, we telephoned those institutions which did not return our postcard (about one-half of the original 250) in order to obtain the desired information. At the end of this process, we had discovered that some 70 institutions on our original list of 250, were not at the time teaching Chinese using regularly employed instructional personnel. We then constructed a master mailing list of the remaining 180 institutions, all of which were mailed the long form of our survey instrument, "Survey Form: Status of Chinese Language Teaching, 1978-79." We subsequently discovered that five of the institutions on our master list of 180 were actually teaching Chinese in a self-instructional mode, and that eleven of the 70 institutions we had treated as having abandoned their Chinese instructional programs actually maintained a self-instructional program. Our rate of return statistics (see Section 3) are based upon returns from both the long form and the self-study survey.

2.0 Development of the "Survey Form: Status of Chinese Language Teaching, 1978-1979"

We began the selection of our survey form items by looking at the instrument used by Richard D. Lambert in his Language and Area Studies Review. We also perused the items of the "CULCON Report on Japanese Studies at Colleges and Universities in the United States Mid-70's," by Elizabeth T. and Joseph A. Massey. Neither of these studies looked at language instruction materials, program structure, method of instruction, utilization of instructional personnel, or student placement in the kind of detail we envisioned for the present study. For this reason, our draft questionnaire form, which was evaluated by a number of Chinese language-teaching experts in November and December of 1978, contained a large number of questions which we had devised ourselves. Consultation regarding the questionnaire was obtained from the following individuals: Profs. Moran and Willis, University of Colorado; Prof. Chao, University of Chicago; Prof. Walton, University of Pennsylvania; Prof. Barnes, University of Pittsburgh; Prof. Wang, Stanford University; Prof. Light, University of Arizona; Prof. DeFrancis, University of Hawaii; Prof. Jorden, Cornell University; Prof. Wrenn, Brown University; Prof. Roy, University of Virginia. Professors Walton and Barnes provided much useful information during the meetings of the Chinese Language Teachers Association in Chicago in November 1978. They provided much further information in subsequent conversations on the telephone. Elizabeth Massey reviewed the questionnaire in detail in January 1979, just prior to the typing of the final draft.

3.0 Conducting the Survey

The intitial mailing of the survey form, including a postpaid self-addressed return envelope, was made in February 1979. Those institutions not returning the questionnnaire were mailed an additional copy of the questionnaire and a reminder letter in early March 1979. Those returning neither the first nor the second questionnaire form were telephoned in March and April 1979 to encourage them to return it.

In the process of examining the returns from our initial survey form, we realized that it would be valuable to design two smaller forms, one for institutions which housed self-instructional Chinese language programs, and one for institutions which had recently abandoned Chinese language instruction programs. (A copy of the long survey form may be found in Appendix C; These short forms were mailed to respondents in March and April 1979.

We had originally intended to have the computerized analysis of our questionnaire data handled through the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C. Our preliminary discussions with Brookings led us to believe that perhaps this would not be appropriate, and we engaged instead the services of Mr. Leonard Shaefer, of Georgetown University's Language Processing Center, to help us with this analysis. Mandel and Eddy worked with Mr. Shaefer during May and June 1979 to develop the code book for use in organizing the questionnare data for machine-readable coding. Coding and keypunching of questionnaire data took place between June and September 1979, and the design of the tables was worked out between Eddy and Shaefer during the months of August, September, and October 1979.

4.0 Survey of Funding Sources, Government and Non-Goverment, Relating to Chinese Language Teaching.

During the early months of 1979, project staff member Sophia Behrens conducted a survey of government funding sources, primarily the United States Office of Education through NDEA Title VI, and The National Endowment for the Humanities, as well as private foundations, to discover the extent of funding for projects which would effect Chinese language teaching in this country. Results of this survey appear in Part 6, Materials of Instruction, and Part 9, Funding.

5.0 Preparation of Final Report

During the months of November 1979 through January 1980, Eddy and Vanderhoff organized the data which had been accumulated over the preceding fifteen months by project staff, and Eddy wrote the final report.

6.0 Other Salient Project Activities

The principal investigator of the project made three trips in order to gather data for the project and to disseminate information about it. In November 1978, he visited Chinese instruction programs at the University of Colorado, where he spoke with Profs. Willis and Moran, and at the University of Chicago where he spoke with Prof. Chao. At the annual meeting of The Chinese Language Teachers Association in November 1978 in Chicago, the principal investigator attended many of the CLTA meetings and had the opportunity to speak with several Chinese language teachers at length. In addition, he was able to announce to a plenary session of that association the existence of this project and to solicit input from the Chinese language teaching profession. During this meeting, a draft version of the large questionnaire was distributed to Chinese language teachers who were in a position to provide criticism and suggestions for its improvement.

In August 1979, the principal investigator visited Stanford University to discuss the Stanford Inter-University Program with Prof. Lyman Van Slyke. He also discussed with project director Albert Dien the Stanford project, funded by the U.S. Office of Education, which has developed a series of videotapes from Taiwanese television for use in American Chinese-language classrooms.

The third trip undertaken by the project director was to present the major findings of the survey to a meeting of the Chinese Language Teachers Association in Atlanta in November 1979. A five-page handout summarizing principal project findings was distributed at this conference. It will be printed in the Spring 1980 number of the Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association.

7.0 Project Staff

Peter A. Eddy has served for the duration of the project as principal investigator. From project startup in September 1978 through September 1979, Ms. Nadine Mandel served as research assistant for the project. In November 1979, Ms. Donna Vanderhoff was hired to work with Eddy until the end of the project. Ms. Sophia Behrens has contributed to several phases of the project: she had a considerable role in the construction of the first draft of the large questionnaire form, and was responsible for gathering the majority of data relating to the funding of Chinese language projects. In addition, she has edited the manuscript of the final report, and will further edit the publication of the report for the Language in Education Series. As mentioned above, Mr. Leonard Shaefer, of Georgetown University's Language Processing Center has served as our principal consultant for data analysis. Finally, Prof. James J. Wrenn, Brown University, has been engaged to write a retrospective appraisal of the State of the Art of Chinese Language Teaching, and to provide guidance to project staff where an intimate knowledge of Chinese language instructional materials and methodology is needed.

APPENDIX B:
LIST OF CHINESE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS UNDER DEVELOPMENT

NOTE: The individual entries in this list include only the information we received from our respondents (e.g. some names are not complete, etc.). The entries include the following information: author's name, institution, title of materials, and, if funded, the source of funding in parentheses. Order of entries in the list is determined by the date of receipt of the respondent's questionnaire. We have divided the list into the following subcatagories:

First-year text materials (including supplementary materials)
First-year character materials
First-year materials-other
Second-year text materials
Second-year character materials
Second-year materials-other
Third-year materials
Fourth-year and beyond materials
Classical Chinese materials
Other materials

First-year text materials (including supplementary materials)

Chang, Washington State U., Essential Chinese.
Nyakken and C. Tang, Ohio U., Speak Mandarin-Supplementary Exercises.
Berninghausen and Chiang, Middlebury College, Written Exercises, Vocabulary, etc.
H. Tiee, U. of Southern California, Learn Chinese.
Moran, U. of Colorado, Boulder, First Steps in Chinese.
Moran, U. of Colorado, Boulder, Edited and Expanded Taiwan Elementary Chinese Text.
Lee, Brigham Young U., Succeed with Standard Chinese (funded by BYU).
Gwang-Tsai Chen, U. of Wisconsin, Madison, Elementary Chinese.
T. T. Ch'en, Princeton U., Beginning Chinese.
(No author listed), U. of Michigan, Dittoed Materials.

First Year Character Materials

(No author listed), Temple U., Character Recognition.
G. W. Roy, U. of Virginia, Reading and Writing Chinese.
Moran, U. of Colorado, Boulder, First Steps in Chinese Character Analysis.
Kuo, Connecticut College, Read Mandarin.
Pang, California State U., Chico, Introduction to Chinese Writing (Video).

First Year Materials - Other

San-pow Li, U. Of Michigan, Dictionary for Elementary and Intermediate Chinese.
Ellie Mao Mok, Baruch College, CUNY Study Aids-Learn Patterns Through Songs.
N. Ching, Ohio State U., Chinese for Trade and Travel (funded by state).

Second Year Text Materials

Chung So, Colby College, Grammar Review.
(No author given), Temple U, Sentence Patterns Review.
T.T. Ch'en, Princeton U., Intermediate Chinese.
Richard Chang, U. of Illinois-Urbana, A Review of Chinese Grammar.
(No author given), U. of Michigan, Cantonese Course.

Second Year Character Materials

Huang and Stimson, Yale U., Written Standard Chinese III.
(No author given), Temple U., Character Recognition.
G.W. Roy, U. of Virginia, Reading and Writing Chinese.

Second Year Materials - Other

Constantine Tung, State U. of New York, Buffalo, Readings in Business Chinese.
Walton and Liu, U. of Pennsylvania, Introduction to Modern China (PRC).
Ching-Yi Dougherty, U. of California, Santa Cruz, Speeches by Chinese Officials and Foreign Vistors to China (for training interpreters).

Third Year Materials

Yin-lien and C. Chin, Vassar College, Language through Literature (funded by unspecified source).
Constantine Tung, State U. of New York, Buffalo, Readings on Contemporary China.
Wan, U. of Kansas, Readings in Modern Chinese.
Moran, U. of Colorado, Exercises for Readings in Chinese Literature.
H.T. Tang, Princeton U., Advanced Modern Chinese.

Fourth Year and Beyond Materials

Willis, U. of Colorado, Boulder, Literature and Language Readers.
C. Lien, Central Connecuticut State College, Advanced Chinese Language Reading Material.
H.T. Tang, Princeton U., Readings in Modern Chinese.

Classical Chinese Materials

Ching Tu, Rutgers U., Readings in Classical Chinese Literature.
N.Y. Tang, Princeton U., Readings in Classical Chinese.

Other Materials

E. Kaplan, Western Washington U., Tapes for Advanced Chinese.

W.C. Li, S.H. Ho, R.L. Cheng, U. of Hawaii, Grammar Handbook (all levels) (funded by USOE).

H. Tiee, U. of Southern California, An Introduction to the Structure of the Chinese Sentence.

Willis, U. of Colorado, Boulder, Etymology, Translation, Structure, and Forms of Chinese for Students of Chinese and Japanese (all levels).

Cheng-Yu, California State U., Long Beach, (No title given): "A Multi-Purpose Volume") (third and fourth year).

Leung, San Jose State U., Videotapes for Teaching Cantonese.

(No author given), George Washington U., Vocabulary Glossary for Lei-Yu and Luo tuo Hsiang-zi Chinese.

E. Ching, Ohio State U., Hsu-Chih-mo and Su Hsiasman (third year) (funded by OSU).

Barnes, U. of Pittsburgh, A Short Course for the PRC.

APPENDIX C

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS
1611 North Kent Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

SURVEY FORM: STATUS OF CHINESE LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE UNITED STATES, 1978-79

Institution: ______________________________

Name of Person Filling Out Form; Title: ______________________________

Phone Number: (   ) ______________________________
area code

Date Returned: ______________________________

PLEASE RETURN BY 30 MARCH 1979

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: Most questions can be answered by placing an "X" next to the appropriate response. Some questions, however, ask you to indicate which of several statements apply to your situation, i.e., possibly more than one. Still others ask you to rank order possible responses. Finally, some questions require a written response.

The questionnaire is divided into six parts: (A) course offerings, enrollments and degree offerings; (B) staffing characteristics; (C) materials of instruction; (D) program characteristics; (E) student characteristics; and, (F) funding. Since we are surveying approximately 180 different institutions, from community colleges through graduate schools, there are some questions which will not apply to your situation. When this is the case, please write NA (not applicable) next to the question.

NOTES: In this questionnaire, we have tried to make several distinctions that we would like to draw your attention to at the outset:

NOTES: (continued)

1. Language-learning versus language-using courses. By the former, we refer to courses where the primary intent is to develop language proficiency. The latter refers to courses conducted in Chinese about literature, linguistics, history, philosophy, etc. This does not include courses in English about such things as Chinese literature and culture, etc.

2. We have attempted in Section B to define several categories of personnel that might be involved with Chinese language teaching on your campus (TAs, tutors, lecturers, and instructors/professors). Please read carefully the note at the beginning of this section.

3. Intensive versus non-intensive instruction. We have not attempted to define what the time requirements are for intensive and non-intensive instruction. You should make the distinction between these two types of courses based upon your usage of the word "intensive" (or lack of it) in your course titles.

4. "Elementary," "intermediate," and "advanced" versus "first year," "second year," etc. Because of possible ambiguity of the terms "intermediate" and "advanced," we ask that you use the latter series of terms when categorizing your Chinese language-learning courses.

SECTION A: COURSES OFFERED, ENROLLMENTS, AND DEGREES AWARDED

A-1. Total enrollments in Chinese language courses. Please provide the total number of graduate and undergraduate students who completed the courses (not the number who showed up for class the first day) for Fall 1974, Fall 1977 and Fall 1978. Please DO NOT include registrations in courses given in English ABOUT Chinese culture, literature or language, and count separately language-learning courses and language-using courses. In language-learning courses, primary focus is on learning the language itself; in language-using courses (usually advanced-level courses) focus is on the subject matter of the course, with the language used as the vehicle of communication, e.g., courses in Chinese literature, political science, economics, history, etc. If you have no students in a particular category, please indicate by putting a zero ("0") in the appropriate space.

	Undergrad Enrollments		Graduate Enrollments	
Year	Language-Learning	Language-Using	Language-Learning	Language-Using
Fall 1974				
Fall 1977				
Fall 1978				

A-2. Courses offered in Chinese and enrollments during 1978-79 academic year. (Include on-campus courses only; Question A-3 will cover extension/off-campus courses.) Please list all courses in Chinese offered, regardless of whether they are being taught this year. Label all courses you call intensive as such. Sequences of courses that take a full academic year should be listed on one line, e.g., Chinese 101, 102, 103 for a first year course. Please list courses according to the categories we have set up: first year, second year, third year, fourth year (and beyond) language courses, and a separate category for language-using courses. IMPORTANT: Do not list any courses taught in English about Chinese literature, language or culture in Groups 1-5. List all such courses in Group 6. For those courses taught during academic year 1978-79, please give graduate and undergraduate enrollments. If the course has not yet met, please estimate and place an asterisk next to the number.

	Course Title and Number	Hours Per Week Total Contact Time[a]	1978-79 Enrollments[b] Undergrad	1978-79 Enrollments[b] Graduate
1. First Year (Elementary)				
2. Second Year (Intermediate)				
3. Third Year (Advanced)				

A-2. (continued)

	Course Title and Number	Hours Per Week Total Contact Time[a]	1978-79 Enrollments[b]	
			Undergrad	Graduate
4. Fourth Year and Beyond (Advanced)				
5. Language-Using Courses (Advanced)				
6. Courses in English				

---

[a] "Total contact time" includes regular class time, scheduled time with a tutor or in a language laboratory. It does not include homework time and time a student spends in the lab on his own.

[b] Please give the number of students who complete the course, not the number who show up the first day.

A-3. Did you offer any of the courses listed in Question A-2, above, during Summer 1978? If so, please list them below and give enrollments.

Course Title and Number	Hours Per Week Total Contact Time[a]	Summer 1978 Enrollments[b]	
		Undergrad	Grad

A-4. Please list courses in Chinese language that are offered by your institution off-campus, as a part of outreach activity or through an extension division; for those courses taught during 1978-79, please give enrollments.

Course Title and Number	Hours Per Week Total Contact Time[a]	1978-79 Enrollments[b]	
		Undergrad	Grad

[a] "Total contact time" includes regular class time, scheduled time with a tutor or in a language laboratory. It does not include homework time and time a student spends in the lab on his own.

[b] Please give the number of students who complete the course, not the number who show up the first day.

A-5. Please list the names of undergraduate degrees or certificates that you award in Chinese language and give the number of students who received their degree in calendar 1978 (i.e., from 1 January 1978 through 31 December 1978).

Name of Degree or Certificate	Number of Recipients: 1978

A-6. Please list the names of graduate degrees or certificates that you award in Chinese language and give the number of students who received their degree in calendar 1978 (i.e., from 1 January 1978 through 31 December 1978).

Name of Degree or Certificate	Number of Recipients: 1978

A-7. What do you anticipate will be the trend at your institution in undergraduate (both community college and college/university level) enrollments over the next five years in Chinese language courses? (Please place an "X" next to the appropriate response.) Enrollments will probably:

_____ (a) decrease.
_____ (b) stay the same.
_____ (c) increase slightly.
_____ (d) increase by 50% or more.
_____ (e) We have no undergraduate students.

A-8. What do you anticipate will be the trend at your institution in graduate enrollments over the next five years in Chinese language courses? (Please place an "X" next to the appropriate response.) Graduate enrollments will probably:

_____ (a) decrease.
_____ (b) stay the same.
_____ (c) increase slightly.
_____ (d) increase by 50% or more.
_____ (e) We have no graduate students.

A-9. Do you see evidence from any quarter that the recent normalization of relations between the U.S. and the Peoples' Republic of China will bring more students to your Chinese language classes? (Please place an "X" next to as many responses as are appropriate.)

_____ (a) We see no such evidence.
_____ (b) Yes, we see more student interest in Chinese.
_____ (c) Yes, the administration of our institution has expressed interest in Chinese language instruction.
_____ (d) Yes, we have seen interest in Chinese language instruction expressed by business/professional people who desire to learn some Chinese.
_____ (e) Other. Please explain: ______________________________

SECTION B: STAFFING CHARACTERISTICS

NOTE: In the questions below, we will use the following titles to describe various instructional staff positions:

1. TA. A graduate teaching assistant, pursuing a post-baccalaureate degree while teaching part-time. Usually not a native speaker of Chinese.

2. Tutor. Does not carry responsibility for instruction; rather, works with students individually or in small groups, usually under the supervision of an instructor/professor. Likely to be part-time; likely to be a native speaker of Chinese.

3. Lecturer. Non-tenure track position on a fixed-year contract, either working under the direction of an instructor/professor or working autonomously. In former case carries more responsibility for instruction than does a tutor; in latter case, can be totally responsible for instruction. Frequently less than full-time; frequently a native speaker of Chinese.

4. Instructor/Professor. Usually tenure track position. Responsible for course development and for instruction, including coordination of the efforts of lecturers, tutors, and TAs.

B-1. In Fall semester/quarter 1978, how many of each of the above categories of personnel were teaching Chinese language at your institution? Please list native speakers and non-native separately. If you have none in a particular category, please write "0" (zero).

	Number of Native Speakers	Number of Non-Native Speakers	
(a)	______	______	TAs
(b)	______	______	Tutors
(c)	______	______	Lecturers
(d)	______	______	Instructors/Professors

133

B-2. Teachers of Chinese language. This question asks for extremely important information. If we are to obtain an accurate picture of Chinese language teaching in the U.S. today, complete responses to this question are essential. While we request that you provide us with the names of individuals, you may leave the name blank, and fill in the information about him or her. Please be assured that complete anonymity (personal and institutional) will be preserved during our analysis and that no names will appear in our published account. Please divide your teachers into the groupings established at the beginning of this section (i.e, TAs, tutors, lecturers, instructors/professors).

Name	Sex M or F	Age	Rank: Title Held At Your Institution	Number of Years At Present Institution	Tenured? "X" If Yes	Tenure-Track Position? "X" If Yes	Percent Full-Time	Highest Relevant Degree
TAs								
TUTORS								
LECTURERS								
INSTRUCTOR/PROFS.								

B-3. At your institution, what courses do TAs (see definition above) teach? ("X" as many spaces as appropriate.)

_____ (a) We have no TAs.
_____ (b) Standard, non-intensive first year Chinese language
_____ (c) Intensive first year Chinese language
_____ (d) Standard, non-intensive second year* Chinese language
_____ (e) Intensive second year* Chinese language
_____ (f) Third year* Chinese language
_____ (g) Fourth year* Chinese language and beyond

B-4. At your institution, in what courses are tutors (see definition above) used? ("X" all appropriate categories.)

_____ (a) We have no tutors.
_____ (b) Standard, non-intensive first year Chinese language
_____ (c) Intensive first year Chinese language
_____ (d) Standard, non-intensive second year* Chinese language
_____ (e) Intensive second year* Chinese language
_____ (f) Third year* Chinese language
_____ (g) Fourth year* Chinese language and beyond

---

* See Note 4 under General Instructions at the beginning of the questionnaire.

B-5. At your institution, what courses do lecturers (see definition above) teach? ("X" all appropriate categories.)

_____ (a) We have no lecturers.
_____ (b) Standard, non-intensive first year Chinese language
_____ (c) Intensive first year Chinese language
_____ (d) Standard, non-intensive second year* Chinese language
_____ (e) Intensive second year* Chinese language
_____ (f) Third year* Chinese language
_____ (g) Fourth year* and beyond Chinese language

B-6. At your institution, what courses do instructors/professors (see definition above) teach? ("X" all appropriate categories.)

_____ (a) We have no instructors/professors.
_____ (b) Standard, non-intensive first year Chinese language
_____ (c) Intensive first year Chinese language
_____ (d) Standard, non-intensive second year* Chinese language
_____ (e) Intensive second year* Chinese language
_____ (f) Third year* Chinese language
_____ (g) Fourth year* and beyond Chinese language

B-7. Do you provide new teaching staff (all types = TAs through Instructors/Professors) with an introduction to and training in your teaching methods?

_____ No _____ Yes

If yes, please describe briefly what you do: _______________________

* See Note 4 under General Instructions at the beginning of the questionnaire.

B-8. Do you evaluate the competence in Chinese of potential staff members?

_____ No _____ Yes

If yes, what incoming staff is subject to this evaluation? ("X" all appropriate categories.)

_____ (a) TAs
_____ (b) Tutors
_____ (c) Lecturers
_____ (d) Instructors/Professors

B-9. If "Yes" to previous question, what is the nature of this evaluation?

_____ (a) Oral interview, to assure that a non-native has adequate control of oral Chinese
_____ (b) Oral interview, to assure that a native Chinese has an accent that will be compatible with the existing program
_____ (c) Writing sample
_____ (d) Other. Explain: _____________________________

B-10. Are teaching staff, regardless of level, provided the opportunity to upgrade their pedagogical competence (e.g., encouraged to read pedagogical material in journals, attend regular meetings held to discuss classroom technique, etc.)?

_____ No _____ Yes

If yes, please describe briefly: _____________________________

B-11. Are teaching staff, regardless of level, provided the opportunity to upgrade their knowledge of contemporary Chinese (study tours to the Far East, workshops on contemporary language in the PRC, etc.)?

_____ No _____ Yes

If yes, please describe briefly: ________________________________

B-12. During academic year 1978-79, are any language-teaching staff (tutors, lecturers or instructors/professors) on leave doing research?

_____ No _____ Yes

If yes, please give name, rank, length of leave, and indicate nature of research: ________________________________

____

____

____

____

B-13. How many teachers of Chinese language is your institution likely to hire over the next five years?

_____ for tenure-track positions

_____ for fixed-year contracts

SECTION C: MATERIALS OF INSTRUCTION

NOTE: We are interested in discovering what texts are being used in both intensive and non-intensive courses. Please be sure to make this distinction in your responses. Please an "N" in Column 2 for non-intensive, an "I" for intensive, and "N/I" when a text is used for both types of courses.

C-1. What basic text(s) do you currently use for the first year Chinese language course?

Course Title and Number	N-I-N/I	Author	Title	Publisher	Year

C-2. What text(s) do you use to introduce Chinese characters in your first year Chinese language course?

Course Title and Number	N-I-N/I	Author	Title	Publisher	Year

C-3. What basic text(s) do you currently use for the second year* Chinese language course?

Course Title and Number	N-I-N/I	Author	Title	Publisher	Year

C-4. What text(s) do you use to continue instruction in the Chinese characters in your second year* Chinese language course?

Course Title and Number	N-I-N/I	Author	Title	Publisher	Year

C-5. What text(s) do you use for your third year* Chinese language-learning course(s) (NOT language-using courses, see definition at beginning of section A, and not courses in classical Chinese)?

Course Title and Number	Author	Title	Publisher	Year

* See Note 4 under General Instructions at the beginning of the questionnaire.

C-6. What text(s) do you use for your fourth year* (and beyond) Chinese language-learning course(s)? (NOT language-using courses, and not classical Chinese.)

Course Title and Number	Author	Title	Publisher	Year

C-7. What text(s) do you use for your courses in classical Chinese?

Course Title and Number	Author	Title	Publisher	Year

C-8. Do you use supplementary materials (i.e., not part of the basic text package) in any of your Chinese language-learning courses (first through fourth year)? If so, please indicate: (a) the course in which they are used; (b) the nature of the materials (printed materials, tapes, slides or filmstrips, video recordings of Chinese language TV programs, feature-length or documentary Chinese language films, radio broadcasts, etc.); (c) the name of the materials; and, (d) how the materials are used.

Course Title and Number	Type of Material	Name of Material	How Used

---

* See Note 4 under General Instructions at the beginning of the questionnaire.

C-9. Are you, or is someone in the Department, currently engaged in developing materials for instruction?

_____ No   _____ Yes

If yes, please give a brief description:

Author	Title	To Be Used At What Level?	Funded?

C-10. Does your library have a Chinese language collection?

_____ No   _____ Yes

If yes, could you try to estimate answers to the following questions:

_____ (a) How many books on China in the Chinese language?
_____ (b) How many subscriptions to serials in Chinese?
_____ (c) How many staff members servicing the collection?

SECTION D: PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

D-1. Which of the following units does your institution use in its scheduling? How long is the unit?

_____ (a) Semester, _____ weeks long
_____ (b) Trimester, _____ weeks long.
_____ (c) Quarter, _____ weeks long
_____ (d) Other. Explain: _____________________________

D-2. How many of your institution's units constitute a "one-year course" in Chinese?

_____ (a) 2 quarters
_____ (b) 3 quarters
_____ (c) 2 trimesters
_____ (d) 2 semesters
_____ (e) Other. Explain: _____________________________

D-3. What is the organizational "home" of Chinese language teaching in your institution?

_____ (a) Department of Chinese Language and Literature
_____ (b) Department of Far Eastern Languages and Literature
_____ (c) Department of Modern Languages
_____ (d) Department of Linguistics
_____ (e) Area studies program
_____ (f) Other. Explain: _____________________________

D-4. Does your institution have an area studies program that relates to China?

_____ (a) No.
_____ (b) Yes, a Chinese area studies program
_____ (c) Yes, a Far Eastern area studies program with a concentration on China
_____ (d) Other. Explain: _______________________________________

D-5. Who determines the Chinese language curriculum at your institution?

_____ (a) Our department alone
_____ (b) The area studies program alone
_____ (c) Our department in conjunction with area studies faculty outside the department
_____ (d) Other. Explain: _______________________________________

D-6. In your undergraduate Chinese language program, what is your attrition rate? Of those students who finish first year language,

(a) _____ percent complete second year.*
(b) _____ percent complete third year.*
(c) _____ percent complete fourth year.*

D-7. Do you test your students' knowledge of Chinese with a proficiency test (i.e., a test not designed to measure student mastery of material learned in a specific course) at any point during your sequence of language courses?

_____ No   _____ Yes

If yes, please name the test and describe it briefly: _________________

* See Note 4 under General Instructions at the beginning of the questionnaire.

D-8. Do you feel that a standardized test of Chinese language proficiency in listening, speaking, reading and writing needs to be developed?

____ No ____ Yes

Comments: ____

D-9. Would you use such a test if it were available?

____ No ____ Yes

Comments: ____

D-10. In what way(s) do you and your colleagues encourage your students of Chinese language to study in a Chinese-speaking country?

____ (a) We do not encourage our students to study abroad.
____ (b) We actively seek to provide them with fellowship money to cover travel and other costs.
____ (c) We make available to students literature concerning study abroad.
____ (d) We accept credits from courses taken abroad.
____ (e) We waive course requirements in our department/section/program if we see that the student has received equivalent instruction abroad.
____ (f) Other. Describe: ____________________

D-11. To which institution(s) in a Chinese-speaking country have you sent students or groups of students in the last three years? Please give name and location of institution, and, if students were sent in groups, name and address of contact person.

School	Location	Group or Individual Students?	Contact	Address of Contact

D-12. Do you have any positive or negative comments concerning the experiences of your students at these institutions?

D-13. About how many of your students spent time studying abroad in summer 1978 or academic year 1978-79?

(a) Of graduate students, _____ spent one semester (quarter) or summer abroad.

(b) Of graduate students, _____ spent the entire year abroad.

(c) Of undergrad. students, _____ spent one semester (quarter) or summer abroad.

(d) Of undergrad. students, _____ spent the entire year abroad.

D-14. Do you collaborate with other institutions in the U.S. in planning to send groups of students to study abroad?

_____ No _____ Yes

If yes, which U.S. institutions? ______________________________

D-15. Do you send your Chinese language students to other institutions within the United States to receive instruction?

_____ No _____ Yes

If "Yes," to which institutions, how many students per year, and for what coursework?

Institution	Number of Students/Year	Names of Courses Usually Taken

D-16. Do the faculty members who teach Chinese language at your institution regularly engage in "outreach" activities in local secondary schools and in the community at large?

_____ No _____ Yes

If yes, describe their activities briefly: ______________________________

D-17. In what dialects other than Mandarin do you offer instruction?

		Number of Students 1978-79	
		Undergraduate	Graduate
_____	(a) Cantonese	_____	_____
_____	(b) Taiwanese (Southern Min)	_____	_____
_____	(c) Other. _____	_____	_____
_____	(d) Other. _____	_____	_____

D-18. After having successfully completed your sequence of Chinese language courses, what forms of romanization are your students able to use? ("X" appropriate responses and comment if necessary.)

_____ (a) Pīn Yīn
_____ (b) Yale
_____ (c) Wade-Giles
_____ (d) Other. _____
Comments: _____

D-19. In Fall 1978, how many sections of first year Chinese language did you have? (NOTE: This data should agree with your responses to question A-2.)

_____ section(s) of non-intensive first year Chinese language
_____ section(s) of intensive first year Chinese language

D-20. What was the average class size for non-intensive versus intensive first year Chinese language classes?

			Non-Intensive	Intensive
_____	(a)	We had no such courses.	_____	_____
_____	(b)	5 students or less	_____	_____
_____	(c)	6-10 students	_____	_____
_____	(d)	11-15 students	_____	_____
_____	(e)	16-20 students	_____	_____
_____	(f)	21 or more students	_____	_____

D-21. How is first year non-intensive versus intensive Chinese instruction organized on your campus? (See definition of staff categories in the note preceding Section B, page 10). Place an "X" in columns to the right to indicate your response.

		Non-Intensive	Intensive
(a)	Instructors/professors manage the instructional process, which is carried out by them and by lecturers (and/or tutors and TAs).	_____	_____
(b)	Instructors/professors and/or lecturers work autonomously, each one responsible for his or her own class; little formal coordination of instruction in different sections	_____	_____
(c)	Instructors/professors and/or lecturers work autonomously; considerable effort made to coordinate between sections	_____	_____
(d)	A team-teaching approach is used, with teachers sharing the responsibility for several sections	_____	_____
(e)	Other. Specify: _____________________	_____	_____

D-22. Please estimate the percent of emphasis placed on the following aspects of instruction in your first through fourth year* and beyond Chinese language courses. Consider not only time spent in class, but also time students spend with a tutor (if any), laboratory work, and homework.

		First Year %	Second Year %	Third Year %	Fourth Year and Beyond %
(a)	% developing correct pronunciation				
(b)	% developing oral mastery of grammatical structures (i.e., structured grammar exercises)				
(c)	% developing communicative competence (i.e., ability to use known patterns to express personal meaning)				
(d)	% developing ability to understand spoken Chinese				
(e)	% developing ability to read Chinese characters				
(f)	% developing ability to write Chinese characters				
(g)	% developing an appreciation of and a knowledge about Chinese culture				
(h)	%. Other. Specify: ____________				
		100%	100%	100%	100%

* See Note 4 under General Instructions at the beginning of the questionnaire.

D-23. What kinds of materials of instruction are most needed to help improve Chinese language instruction at your institution? Please rank order these needs from the following list, with "1" being the materials most needed. If you feel that some items listed are not needed, do not rank them.

Rank
Order

_____ (a) Graded reading material
_____ (b) Graded listening comprehension material
_____ (c) "Real-life" listening comprehension material from Chinese TV and film (Taiwan and Hong Kong)
_____ (d) Materials from the Peoples' Republic of China for both listening and reading comprehension
_____ (e) Better materials to teach Chinese characters to Americans
_____ (f) Other. ______________________________

D-24. What instructor-related changes do you think would improve Chinese language instruction at your institution? Please rank order these from the following list, with "1" being the most desirable change. If you feel that some are not needed, do not rank them.

Rank
Order

_____ (a) Smaller classes in language-learning courses in the first year and second year
_____ (b) More thorough pedagogical training before beginning teaching for those who will be responsible for instruction, i.e., instructors/professors and lecturers
_____ (c) More opportunity to work with Chinese language-teaching experts who would visit campus to consult or hold off-campus workshops
_____ (d) More native speakers of Chinese used as lecturers and tutors
_____ (e) More thorough pedagogical training for tutors and TAs
_____ (f) Other. Explain: ______________________________

D-25. How do you and your colleagues use tape recordings in your language instruction? Please rank order your responses, with the most frequently used being "1". If you do not employ a particular technique, do not rank it.

Rank
Order

_____ (a) Tape recorder used in classroom.
_____ (b) Class attends language laboratory together; all listen to same tape.
_____ (c) Class members attend laboratory outside class time, check out tapes they need using a "library system."
_____ (d) Students make (or have made) take-home cassettes, which they use on tape recorders in their homes.
_____ (e) Other. Specify: ________________________________

D-26. For what purpose do you use tape recorded material in your Chinese language classes (first through fourth year and beyond*)? Please rank order the following possible uses, omitting those not applicable and adding others not on our list, with "1" the most common use.

Rank
Order

_____ (a) Listening comprehension
_____ (b) Pronunication practice
_____ (c) Structure drills
_____ (d) Other. Explain: ________________________________
_____ (e) Other. Explain: ________________________________

---

* See Note 4 under General Instructions at the beginning of the questionnaire.

D-27. Please describe briefly any aspects of your Chinese language instructional program that you feel might be of interest to (a) others in the Chinese language-teaching community and (b) the American population at large, e.g., cooperative agreements with professional schools to provide on-the-job experience using Chinese in law, engineering, etc.; particularly successful outreach programs in your community; successful use of A-V media; team-teaching approach, etc.

SECTION E: STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

E-1. Of the students registering for Chinese language instruction at your institution for the first time in fall 1978, how many arrived with enough competence in Chinese to place into second year and above Chinese language courses*?

	Undergrad.	Grad.
(a) Total number of new students, fall 1978		
(b) Number of these placing into second year		
(c) Number of these placing into third year		
(d) Number of these placing into fourth year (and above)		

E-2. How many of those students referred to in E-1 learned Chinese under the following circumstances:

	Undergrad.	Grad.
(a) U.S. citizens, these students learned Chinese in the home or community.		
(b) Native speakers who immigrated to U.S.		
(c) Learned Chinese in high school.		
(d) Learned Chinese in community college.		
(e) Learned Chinese in another college or university.		
(f) Other. Describe: ________________		

---

* See Note 4 under General Instructions at the beginning of the questionnaire.

E-3. What dialects of Chinese were spoken by those students (both undergraduate and graduate) taking a course in Chinese for the first time at your institution in fall 1978, who had acquired their Chinese in ethnic communities in the U.S. or who were immigrants?

(a) Mandarin _____ students
(b) Cantonese _____ students
(c) Taiwanese (Southern Min) _____ students
(d) Other: ________________ _____ students

E-4. If other institutions (high school, college or other) are fairly regularly providing you with students who know some Chinese, please provide the following information:

Institution Name	Address	Contact Person	Approx. No. Students Per Year With Knowledge of Chinese

E-5. How do you evaluate the Chinese language competence of incoming students in order to place them? ("X" as many as appropriate.)

_____ (a) Virtually all our incoming students have no measurable command of Chinese.
_____ (b) Informal oral interview with an instructor
_____ (c) Formal oral interview with established criteria, such as the Foreign Service Institute's oral interview test
_____ (d) Recommendation from former teacher
_____ (e) Written test. Please name and describe briefly: ______________
____
_____ (f) Other. Explain: ______________________________

E-6. Have you polled your students recently to determine their reasons for studying Chinese?

_____ No _____ Yes

If yes, please summarize the results and/or include a description of the survey results with your returned questionnaire:

____

____

____

____

____

E-7. Of your students of Chinese who received their degrees in 1978, how many are planning to become teachers of Chinese language (not literature or area studies)?

_____ Undergraduate _____ Graduate

E-8. What pedagogical courses are available to students at your institution who want to prepare themselves to teach Chinese?

Course Title and Number	Brief Description

E-9. Of those students (undergraduate and graduate) taking third and fourth year* courses at your institution this year (academic year 1978-79), how many are majoring in a disciplinary area other than Chinese language? (See question A-2 for your report of enrollments in this year's third and fourth year and beyond students.)

	Undergrad.	Grad.
(a) Total number of students enrolled in third and fourth (and above) year language courses (from Question A-2)		
(b) Number of these students who are majoring in areas other than Chinese language and/or literature		

E-10. In your institution, about how many students per year, both undergraduate and graduate, achieve speaking and reading proficiency which might be described as follows (include in your totals those students who achieve a higher proficiency than described)?

	Undergrad. Students	Grad. Students
(a) Reading: Can read simple prose, in a form equivalent to typescript or printing, on subjects within a familiar context.		
(b) Speaking/Listening: Able to handle with confidence but not with facility most social situations including casual conversations about current events. Can also handle limited work requirements.		

Comments: ______________________________

* See Note 4 under General Instructions at the beginning of the questionnaire.

E-11. Does the Chinese language-teaching staff take any part in the placement of your graduating majors?

_____ No _____ Yes

If yes, please explain briefly: ______________________________

E-12. It is very important to know what happens to individuals who have developed competence in Chinese, after they graduate from academic institutions. Please provide information briefly for those individuals who graduated from your institution during calendar year 1978 with at least the competence in Chinese described in E-10 above.

Name	Degree	Major	Employment/Study Plans or Current Status

SECTION F: FUNDING

F-1. We would like to get an estimate of the amount spent in the U.S. during the current academic year (1978-79) on Chinese language teaching. We are particularly interested in what portion of these costs are borne by sources outside your college/university's general funds. Please estimate the dollar amounts for university, outside, and total expenditure (include expenses for both graduate and undergraduate programs).

	University Funded	Outside Funded	Total
(a) Total cost of salaries for staff teaching Chinese			
(b) Non-personnel costs: travel, materials, supplies, equipment, etc.			

F-2. Is Chinese language instruction currently being supported by federal funds on your campus?

_____ No   _____ Yes

If yes, how much is being spent during the 1978-79 academic year on language instruction? $________________

F-3. Is Chinese language instruction on your campus being supported by private foundation grants?

_____ No   _____ Yes

If yes, how much for this academic year? $ 160

F-4. Are you currently receiving money from abroad to support Chinese language instruction?

_____ No _____ Yes

If yes, from where? ______________________________

If yes, how much for this academic year? $______________

THANK YOU!

APPENDIX D

List of Respondents to Long Survey Form
(Reproduced in Appendix C)

CASE NO.	INSTITUTION NAME	INSTITUTION TYPE*
1	University of Illinois at Chicago Circle	0
2	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	1
3	Washington State University	1
4	Merritt College	4
5	Occidental College	2
6	Vassar College	3
7	Pasadena Area Community College	4
8	Arizona State University	1
9	Wayne State University	1
10	California State University, Hayward	2
11	West Virginia University	1
12	University of California, Santa Cruz	1
13	Hofstra University	1
14	William Paterson College	2
15	Fairleigh Dickinson University	2
16	University of Montana	1
17	Western Michigan University	1
18	University of Iowa	1
19	Colby College	3
20	New School for Social Research	1
21	State University of New York at Buffalo	2
22	University of Texas at Austin	1
23	Yale University	0
24	Temple University	1
25	Kalamazoo College (dropped; self-instructional program)	
26	Earlham College	3
27	University of Toledo	1
28	U.S. Air Force Academy	2
29	University of Arkansas	1
30	University of New Mexico	1
31	University of Florida	1
32	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	1
33	University of Virginia	0
34	State University of New York at Brockport	2
35	Wheaton College (Mass.)	3
36	American Graduate School of International Management	2
37	Ohio University	1
38	Columbia University	0
39	Queens College	2
40	Denison University	3

CASE NO.	INSTITUTION NAME	INSTITUTION TYPE*
41	University of Alabama	1
42	University of South Carolina, Columbia	1
43	Middlebury College	3
44	Western Washington University	2
45	Long Beach City College	4
46	University of Massachusetts, Boston	2
47	Bowdoin College	3
48	University of Kansas	1
49	Cabrillo College	4
50	U.S. Naval Academy	3
51	Harvard University	0
52	University of Minnesota	1
53	University of Hawaii, Honolulu	0
54	Pomona College	3
55	University of Southern California	0
56	University of Colorado, Boulder	1
57	Florida State University	1
58	Wake Forest University	2
59	University of Oregon	1
60	Wofford College	3
61	Connecticut College	2
62	De Anza Community College	4
63	Washington and Lee University	3
64	Brigham Young University	1
65	Los Angeles City College	4
66	University of California, San Diego	2
67	Wittenberg University	3
68	Rutgers University	1
69	Boston College	1
70	U.S. Military Academy	2
71	State University of New York at New Paltz	2
72	Miami University, Ohio	1
73	Central Connecticut State College	2
74	University of Wisconsin, Madison	1
75	Oklahoma State University	1
76	California State University, Los Angeles	2
77	Wellesley College	3
78	Sacramento City College	0
79	Princeton University	4
80	Vanderbilt University	1
81	Oakland University	2
82	Hawaii Loa College	2
83	University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point	2
84	Baruch College, CUNY	2
85	University of Pennsylvania	1
86	Duke University	1
87	University of Massachusetts, Amherst	0
88	Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	1
89	University of Illinois, Urbana	0
90	Swarthmore College	3

CASE NO.	INSTITUTION NAME	INSTITUTION TYPE*
91	University of California, Berkeley	0
92	Orange Coast College	2
93	California State University, Chico	2
94	University of California, Santa Barbara	1
95	University of Michigan	
96	Seton Hall University	2
97	Los Angeles Harbor College	4
98	California State University, Long Beach	2
99	State University of New York at Stony Brook	1
100	Santa Rosa Junior College	4
101	San Jose Junior College	2
102	Monterey Institute of International Studies	2
103	Foothill College	4
104	San Diego State University	2
105	Washington University, Missouri	1
106	George Washington University	1
107	University of Washington, Seattle	0
108	Boston University	1
109	Ohio State University	1
110	Tufts University	1
111	University of Pittsburgh	1
112	Brown University	1

* 0 = NDEA Center
1 = Large University
2 = Small University
3 = Four-Year College
4 = Two-Year College

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cohen, Gail A., Ed. Summer Study Abroad, 1979. New York: Institute of International Education.

__________, U.S. College-Sponsored Programs Abroad: Academic Year, 1979. New York: IIE.

Gardner, Richard C. and W. E. Lambert, 1972. Attitudes and Motivation In Second-Language Learning. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

"Inter-University Program for Chinese Language Studies in Taipei." In the Report on the Joint Evaluation Session of Intensive Overseas Language Programs, June 1978, pp. 31-50. ED 168 298.

Johnson, Dora E., et al., 1976. Languages of Eastern Asia, (A Survey of Materials for the Study of Uncommonly Taught Languages, No. 5.) Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Jones, Randall L. and Bernard Spolsky, Eds., 1975. Testing Language Proficiency, Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics. ED 107 161

Lindbeck, John M.H., 1971. Understanding China: An Assessment of American Scholarly Resources. New York: Praeger.

Massey, Elizabeth T. and Joseph A. Massey. "Language Competence of American Specialists on China: A Quantitative Analysis." December 1974.

"Report on the Joint Evaluation Session of Intensive Overseas Language Programs." 1978.

Thompson, Richard T. "Survey of Students Taking Chinese Language Courses, 1976-77." University of Hawaii, 1977.

Wrenn, James J. Chinese Language Teaching in the United States: The State Of The Art. ED 020 525